

VOLUME XVIII

DECEMBER, 1932

NUMBER 8

BULLETIN
OF
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ANNUAL MEETING,
NEW HAVEN, DECEMBER 28, 29
COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY TEACHING
PROGRESS REPORT
INDEX

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE: JOSEPH ALLEN; PAUL KAUFMAN;
JOSEPH MAYER: H. W. TYLER, *Chairman*

Publication Office: 20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.

Editorial Office: 744 JACKSON PLACE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Issued monthly except in June, July, August, and September

Entered as Second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at
Easton, Pa., under the act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103.
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| EDITORIAL NOTE..... | 527 |
| NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS | |
| Annual Meeting..... | 528 |
| Academic Freedom and Tenure in Medical Schools..... | 529 |
| Recent Educational Statistics..... | 530 |
| Association of American Colleges..... | 530 |
| The Education Index..... | 531 |
| Institute of International Education, Annual Report..... | 531 |
| <i>Union Académique Internationale</i> | 532 |
| COMMITTEE ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY TEACHING..... | 533 |
| EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION | |
| A Self-Study of College Teaching, <i>William B. Munro</i> | 549 |
| The Improvement of Teaching, <i>Charles H. Judd</i> | 552 |
| The Improvement of College Teaching, <i>Homer L. Dodge</i> .. | 558 |
| The College of Education and the University, <i>P. C. Packer</i> | 566 |
| The Teacher as Colleague, <i>Ernest H. Wilkins</i> | 570 |
| LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES | |
| Columbia University, Improvement in College Teaching.. | 576 |
| University of Delaware, Chapter Program for the Year... | 576 |
| Harvard University, "Depression" Courses in Business... | 576 |
| Massachusetts Institute of Technology Finances Free | |
| Courses for Unemployed Engineers and Architects... | 577 |
| University of Oklahoma, Chapter Activities..... | 578 |
| New Chapters..... | 578 |
| MEMBERSHIP | |
| Members Elected..... | 580 |
| Nominations for Membership..... | 582 |
| INDEX FOR 1932..... | 589 |
| APPOINTMENT SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENTS | |
| Teachers Available..... | 597 |
| Vacancies Reported..... | 597 |

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATION INDEX.

EDITORIAL NOTE

The current issue is devoted mainly to the recent activities of the Committee on College and University Teaching as a basis for discussion at the Annual Meeting. The progress report by Chairman Munro is based on a meeting of the Committee held at Chicago in October. It is anticipated that another meeting of the Committee will be held in April with a view to publication of an extended report in the *May Bulletin*.

The group of articles included under Educational Discussion were prepared by members of the Committee and Dean Packer of Iowa, for publication in *The Journal of Higher Education*. By the courtesy of the Journal, they are reprinted for the information of our members. Additional papers by B. H. Bode, "Aims in College Teaching," Charles A. Beard, "Quest for Academic Power," Hardin Craig, "The University and the College," F. K. Richtmyer, "Education versus Training" will appear in the January issue, together with a report by Fernandus Payne, as Chairman of a Committee of the Association of Universities.

Replies to the November Chapter Letter indicate general approval of the plan for only occasional publication of the membership list. Considerable interest is expressed in protesting the restriction of employment of foreign students by the Department of Labor.

A large amount of information in regard to methods of retrenchment by institutions has been received from chapters and transmitted to the Committee on the Economic Condition of the Profession. The situation is at present too unstable for the publication of statistical information, but the Committee will report at the Annual Meeting and further publication will follow.

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Annual Meeting

The nineteenth Annual Meeting is to be held at New Haven, Connecticut, December 28 and 29, in connection with the Modern Language Association and the Linguistic Society of America.

Headquarters and Registration: Hall of Graduate Studies, Yale University. The business sessions are to be held in Room 220. A registration fee of fifty cents is to be paid by each person registering.

Railroad Fares: Members should purchase either holiday round-trip tickets or one-way tickets to New Haven, in the latter case securing from the ticket agent a "Convention Certificate" for each ticket. These certificates should be left with the clerk when registering, for validation by the agent of the railways. A return ticket will be sold at half fare upon presentation of validated certificate.

Local Committee: Professor Yandell Henderson, Chairman, Professors Stuart R. Brinkley, Maurice R. Davie, Ernest J. Hall, Carl F. Schreiber, Yale University.

Stenographic Reports: Condensed stenographic reports of the Annual Meeting will be available about January 30 at \$5.00 each, if applied for in advance.

PROGRAM

Wednesday, December 28, 1932

- 9:00 A.M. Registration of delegates and members, Rooms 116-117.
10:00 A.M. *First Session.*
The Economic Condition of the Profession, Report of Committee Z, Professor S. H. Slichter, *Chairman*, Harvard University.
Relation of Junior Colleges to Higher Education, Report of Committee J, Professor A. C. Krey, *Chairman*, University of Minnesota.
Required Courses in Education, Report of Committee Q, Professor Kenneth P. Williams, *Chairman*, Indiana University.
Reports of Officers, Council, and Committees.
12:30 P.M. Luncheon, New Haven Lawn Club.
Tickets \$1.00 at registration desk.

2:00 P.M. *Second Session.*

College and University Teaching, Report of Committee U, Professor W. B. Munro, *Chairman*, California Institute of Technology. Supplementary reports: Professor Homer L. Dodge, *Field Secretary*, University of Oklahoma; Professor Fernandus Payne, *Secretary*, Indiana University.

Discussion of Committee Report.

7:00 P.M. Annual Dinner, New Haven Lawn Club.

Tickets \$2.00 at registration desk.

Thursday, December 29, 1932

9:30 A.M. *Third Session.*

Academic Freedom and Tenure, Report of Committee A, Professor S. A. Mitchell, *Chairman*, University of Virginia.

Procedure in Admission of Members, Report of Committee F, Professor E. S. Brightman, *Chairman*, Boston University.

Report of Nominating Committee and Election of Officers.

Unfinished and Miscellaneous Business.

11:00 A.M. Round table discussion of special topics presented by delegates.

1:00 P.M. Joint Luncheon with the Modern Language Association and the Linguistic Society of America, as the guests of Yale University, University Dining Hall.

2:30 P.M. Council Meeting, Room 119, Hall of Graduate Studies.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE IN MEDICAL SCHOOLS

At a meeting of the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, October 22, the following resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, That a statement regarding the procedure in making and terminating faculty appointments in medical schools be included in the Essentials of an Acceptable Medical School."

The Essentials will contain the statement:

"Reasonable security of tenure must be assured in order that the personnel of the faculty may have adequate stability."

RECENT EDUCATIONAL STATISTICS

Office of Education Bulletin, 1931, Number 20, contains a statistical summary of education from which the following figures (in round numbers) are quoted:

Approximately 30,000,000 students were enrolled in day schools in 1930, including 1,100,000 on the college level. Less than 12% are assigned to private education. The total in elementary schools and kindergartens was 24,000,000; in secondary schools, 4,800,000. The percentage of high school graduates continuing their education showed a decline from 14.4 in 1921 to 12.9 in 1929 in spite of the fact that the percentage of girls increased from 15.5 to 16.3. It is estimated that in 1930 there were approximately 1,700,000 living college graduates, or twenty-three in every thousand of the adult population. More than 1,000,000 teachers in 1930 constituted $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ of the number of persons ten years of age and over and gainfully employed.

The percentage of men teachers increased from 18.5 in 1920 to 20.9 in 1930. The number of teachers in collegiate departments of universities and colleges in 1930 was 54,195, including 14,460 women. These figures do not include professional schools or teachers' colleges. The total income of public universities, colleges, and professional schools during 1929-30 was \$235,000,000, including \$19,000,000 from the Federal Treasury, \$126,000,000 from states, and \$44,000,000 from students' fees. The total income of private universities, colleges, and professional schools was \$396,000,000, including \$156,000,000 from students' fees. For public and private education, the annual cost in 1930 per adult was \$44.34. Between twelve and thirteen cents a day for the voting population would meet the entire expense of the education of approximately 30,000,000 students.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

The November *Bulletin* deals at length with the question: How can the colleges be financed? Problems of administration are discussed by H. N. Davis, "Benefactions vs. Higher Tuitions"; R. W. Ogan, "Shall Students Pay Operating Costs"; J. H. MacCracken, J. H. Kirkland, G. F. Zook, "Specific Techniques." Other sections deal with Methods of Fund-Raising, Cooperative Plans, How It Has Been Done, The Broad Outlook, etc.

THE EDUCATION INDEX

The first cumulative volume of *The Education Index* covering the past three and a half years has recently been published by the H. W. Wilson Company. This contains a complete index to the contents of the *Bulletin* and is an exhaustive bibliography of recent educational literature.

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION, ANNUAL REPORT

In his thirteenth annual report to the Board of Trustees, the Director discusses the effects of current economic conditions on higher education, and particularly the unemployment among university graduates.

There is no immediate solution of the problem, and the university graduate of today and tomorrow will everywhere continue to face a grave situation. A most careful study and analysis of the problem is needed, and that takes time. It is the natural function of the Commission of Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations to undertake such a study. May we not justifiably turn for help in our own country to the Social Science Research Council or the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching?

Attention is called to the remarkable action of the New York State Board of Medical Examiners in announcing in the public press that the graduates of medical faculties of the Universities of France, Switzerland, and Italy would be refused admission to the examinations for license to practice medicine in New York State until the standards of those medical faculties had been raised to the equivalent of those of American Medical Schools. Protests within the United States caused the Board to modify its regulation within three days.

The numerical statement of exchange students lists 170 foreign students in the United States and 177 American students abroad. The former number includes 28 French, 19 Latin-Americans; the latter includes 54 Americans in Germany, 22 in France. A statistical comparison of the number of foreign students in the colleges and universities of the United States shows a maximum total of 9961 in 1930-31, followed by 8688 in 1931-32, but the falling off would be insignificant but for the omission of institutions, in 1931 and 1932, which were not on the accredited list. The total number in 1921 and 1922 was 6488. A tabulation by institutions for 1931 and 1932 shows 818 at California, 283 at Southern California, 285 at Chicago,

264 at Harvard, 262 at Michigan, 322 at Minnesota, 826 at Columbia, 215 at Cornell, 476 at New York, 202 at Washington (Seattle), etc.

Union Académique Internationale

The thirteenth annual meeting of the *Union Académique Internationale* was held in Brussels on May 23-26, thirteen countries being represented. The delegates of the United States, being the representatives of the American Council of Learned Societies, were the Permanent Secretary, Dr. W. G. Leland, Professor B. L. Ullman (University of Chicago), Monsignor George Lacombe (Catholic University of America), and Dr. D. H. Stevens (Rockefeller Foundation).

The most important administrative measure taken during the meeting was an agreement that there should be placed upon the docket of the next meeting, with a favorable recommendation, an amendment to the Statutes which would make it possible for the annual meetings of the *Union* to be held elsewhere than at Brussels, provided they are so held upon the invitation of one of the affiliated learned bodies and in the city where the latter has its headquarters, and provided that such an arrangement shall appear useful to the work of the *Union*.

Encouraging progress was reported on most of the projects sponsored by the Union. Those in which American scholars are actively participating are the Corpus of Ancient Vases, an American fascicle of which is about to be sent to the press; the collection of material on Indonesian customary law, in connection with which the American Council of Learned Societies has selected a great number of documents from the Otley-Beyer collection in Manila which it proposes to edit and publish; the dictionaries of Medieval Latin and of British Medieval Latin; a catalogue of the manuscript Latin translations of Aristotle preserved in European and American collections, which is being compiled as a preliminary to a corpus of the Latin translations of Aristotle; and a paleographical guide to Latin manuscripts prior to the ninth century, which is a project of the American Council of Learned Societies in cooperation with the Carnegie Institution of Washington, under the direction of Dr. E. A. Lowe.

The Union voted to sponsor the publication of a concordance and index to the Mussulman Tradition, to be carried out under the auspices of the Royal Academy of Sciences of Amsterdam.

W. G. LELAND

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY TEACHING

PROGRESS REPORT OF COMMITTEE U

At a meeting of the Committee held in Chicago on October 22-23 it was decided to submit to the chapters of the Association and to the annual meeting a progress report which would explain the procedure which has been followed by the Committee, raise various questions which seem to be worthy of further discussion, and set forth certain tentative conclusions which have been reached.¹

The Committee's Procedure

At the outset of its work the Committee made two important decisions. First, it resolved to gather its materials by personal visitation rather than by the more common procedure of sending out questionnaires. To this end arrangements were made to have Professor Homer L. Dodge of the University of Oklahoma visit a considerable number of universities and colleges in which experiments with new methods of teaching are now being carried on. About fifty such institutions in various parts of the country were visited in this way and data concerning various phases of the teaching problem were collected at each of them. Wherever practicable a special meeting of the local chapter was also held in order that the local data might be supplemented by a discussion of its bearings upon the general questions involved. From these visitations and discussions a large amount of new, valuable, and suggestive material was accumulated. This was then collated in usable form for members of the Committee.

In the second place the Committee decided that it would concentrate its attention on certain immediate and practical problems connected with the improvement of teaching, making no attempt to follow the entire subject through all its ramifications. An entire meeting was given over to the selection of these problems, a list of

¹ The membership of the Committee is as follows: William B. Munro, Chairman (California Institute of Technology); F. K. Richtmyer, Vice-Chairman (Cornell University); Ferdinandus Payne, Secretary (Indiana University); George Boas (Johns Hopkins University); A. L. Bondurant (University of Mississippi); Alzada Comstock (Mount Holyoke College); Hardin Craig (Stanford University); Charles H. Judd (University of Chicago); H. L. Dodge (University of Oklahoma), Field Director.

Advisory Members: J. R. Angell (Yale University); S. P. Capen (University of Buffalo); L. D. Coffman (University of Minnesota); Kathryn McHale (American Association of University Women); H. W. Tyler (Washington Office); W. E. Wickenden (Case School of Applied Science); E. H. Wilkins (Oberlin College). All the foregoing were present at the Chicago meeting with the exception of Presidents Angell and Wilkins. Dr. Paul Monroe has been unable to serve as an advisory member on account of absence from the country.

which was published in the March issue of the Association's *Bulletin*. Realizing, moreover, that some of these matters had already been made the subject of study by various committees of the Association in past years, and that other organizations have also been investigating the possibility of securing improvements in the quality of college teaching, the Committee arranged with Professor Fernandus Payne of the Indiana University to make a survey of all such published reports as well as of the other literature bearing on the subject and to prepare a digest of the more relevant portions. An elaborate summary of this material was given to each member of the Committee for study prior to the Chicago meeting.

The foregoing procedure has proved to be well adapted to the ends desired. It has enabled members of the Committee to become acquainted with the results of past investigations, with the general literature on the subject, and with all the more significant experiments which are now being carried on. It has promoted a lively discussion of the teaching problem among members of the Association at a considerable number of universities and colleges. It has extended an opportunity for participation in this survey to many hundreds of college teachers throughout the country, thus bringing the Committee into close contact with the views and reactions of the profession as a whole.

A Fundamental Question: What Is Good Teaching?

At the very beginning of their deliberations the members of the Committee were brought face to face with certain fundamental questions which are difficult to answer, if, indeed, they are capable of being answered at all. What is good teaching and how can it be differentiated from poor teaching? What are the qualities which prefigure the good teacher in the college classroom? What is the goal at which the good teacher should aim? Good teaching is sometimes defined as the kind of teaching which reaches the desired end. But what is the end desired?

Obviously the goal will not be an identical one in all institutions, in all subjects, or as respects students of different stages in academic maturity. A study made some years ago under the auspices of the Modern Language Association reached the conclusion that "ability to read a foreign language" was the primary objective in modern language teaching. Committees of other learned societies have also from time to time reached conclusions as to the primary end which

is sought to be reached by effective teaching in their respective fields. It would appear self-evident, accordingly, that there are as many goals in teaching as there are subjects to be taught. Moreover, the desired end may be quite different, within the same subject, as respects elementary and postgraduate instruction. Nothing would seem to be more futile, therefore, than an attempt to define good teaching, or the qualities of a good teacher, by inditing generalizations which neglect the wide variations among institutions, among subjects, and in the capacity of the students concerned.

Are Criteria of Good Teaching Practicable?

Nevertheless it is clearly desirable that usable criteria for the differentiation of good teaching from poor teaching should be worked out. For it is only in some such way that good teaching, as such, can be assured of discovery and recognition. The working-out of such criteria is a matter for local self-determination. The Committee believes that it should be done in every institution by the individual departments, each for itself and in its own way—and by all the members of a department working together, not by the department-head alone.

Such a step, initiated by the active members of the teaching profession rather than by college administrators, would seem to hold a considerable promise of improvement in the general standards of college teaching. To encourage good teaching one must first have some agreed-upon way of determining what good teaching is, and obviously the ones to agree upon a rational method of evaluation are those who stand in close relation to the problem itself.

The desirability of progress in this direction is accentuated by the existence of a widespread impression, outside academic circles, that college teaching does not now represent a high level of effectiveness. The Committee believes that this impression is without any sound basis in the actualities of the situation. It has found good reason to believe that the general quality of college teaching has undergone a steady improvement during the past thirty years and that it does not now deserve most of the criticisms which are directed against it. There would seem to be no more conclusive way of putting an end to such aspersions, however, than by having college teachers themselves undertake the critical appraisal of their own work, thus demonstrating that they are obtaining, by the use of their own teaching technique, the results which they have set out to obtain.

Recruiting the Profession

Good teaching is a matter of men as well as of methods. Hence it is well to raise the question whether the profession is drawing into its ranks the kind of recruits that it ought to have. Such a question does not lend itself to any answer of demonstrable conclusiveness, but there is a widespread feeling, even among professors themselves, that the profession of college teaching has not been making a sufficiently strong appeal to the ablest young minds of the nation. Among undergraduates who achieve the highest scholastic rank and who are also endowed with personal qualifications of a high order, only a small percentage choose college teaching as a career. It is sometimes argued that this situation arises from the relatively modest scale of salaries paid to college professors; but such an explanation loses much of its force when one observes that young men of independent means, who do not have to take account of professional earnings, are just as scarce as any others among those who enter the ranks of the professoriate.

The durable satisfactions of the teaching profession, in its higher ranks, ought to be more clearly presented to those young scholars whose qualifications for entering it are conspicuous. On the other hand a vigorous effort should be made to discourage those whose promise of success in the profession is at all doubtful. This is particularly to be desired during the next few years when the number of applicants for teaching positions in universities and colleges is likely to be far in excess of the number of vacancies. There will be an opportunity to give preference to those candidates who, besides possessing high qualifications in their special subjects, are known to have breadth of intellectual interest and background.

Present Facilities for the Selection of Teachers

The Committee has considered the question whether the methods now used in the selection of college teachers can be improved. Large and small institutions feel somewhat differently as to the urgency of the need for better facilities here. In many small colleges it is felt that the ways and means which are now available to them in their quest for capable young teachers do not measure up to the needs of the situation. When they want a new instructor or assistant professor their usual practice is to make inquiry at one or more graduate schools. The graduate school recommends somebody on the ground who needs a job and who is ready for a job. It recommends him

mainly because he has just completed his work for the doctor's degree and has shown promise in research by writing a good thesis.

Teachers in graduate schools rarely think of recommending anyone who has been out in the world for three or four years, teaching in some institution where he has demonstrated a marked degree of capacity as a teacher. The forgotten man in the small college may be a first-rate teacher and worthy of consideration for a more important post, but he is forgotten because he is already placed and because he is not doing the kind of research work that attracts attention. Our Appointment Service, now in its fourth year of operation, has aimed in a measure to meet this need.

Among other suggestions as to how the area of choice open to colleges in the recruiting of their faculties might be widened, one is that colleges be encouraged to advertise vacancies in the professional journals, such as the *American Mathematical Monthly*, the *American Historical Review*, the *Classical Journal*, etc. Another is that the American Association of University Professors might maintain in connection with its Appointment Service a permanent field representative whose duty it would be to go from college to college inquiring about prospective vacancies on the one hand and obtaining information about teachers of unusual competence on the other. While the Committee recognizes the practical difficulties which are involved in both these suggestions it believes them to be worth discussing.

Meanwhile there is a more or less general complaint on the part of colleges that graduate schools recommend to them candidates who have had no experience in teaching and who have no promise of becoming good teachers. Although this criticism has been so freely voiced, it does not seem to have a great deal of basis. The number of young men who complete their work in the graduate schools without having tried their hands at teaching seems to be relatively small. Surveys made at two or three of the larger institutions indicate that from 80% to 90% of those who receive the doctorate of philosophy have held teaching positions in schools or colleges before completing their graduate study. It may be, and probably is, true, however, that the outcome of this experience is not fully looked into either by those who give the recommendations or those who make the appointments, or that when known it is not given adequate emphasis. The Committee raises the question whether the graduate schools should be strongly urged to lay greater stress on teaching

competence when they recommend instructors for appointment to college faculties.

The Relation of Teaching to Research

This suggests the further question whether some of the fault may not be with the colleges themselves in that they ask, in most cases, that the candidates recommended to them shall be young men who give promise of research productivity. Moreover it is well recognized by the graduate schools that the rapidity of a teacher's advancement, even in colleges which profess to desire teaching capacity above all things else, is all too often dependent upon the success of his research work.

It is true, of course, that most colleges assert themselves ready to recognize and reward good teaching on the same basis as successful research, or even on a higher basis. But a serious difficulty in making any such parity effective is found in the fact that success in research gets itself automatically rewarded while successful teaching does not. This is because advancement in rank and salary so frequently come in the wake of a call to another institution, and such calls nearly always result from the reputation which a teacher gains through his research activities. Success in research, moreover, is self-evident. It gains recognition in scientific periodicals and at the hands of learned societies. Good teaching, even though it be conspicuously good, rarely gets recognition beyond the bounds of the campus.

Accordingly, if good teaching is actually to be put on an equality with research as a basis for advancement in rank and salary, it would seem essential that some well-thought-out means for automatically discovering the really good teacher shall be devised and utilized. Good teaching should not be left to make itself known to a teacher's colleagues, to heads of departments, and to college administrators through casual channels such as the gossip of undergraduates or the chance remarks of alumni. In the judgment of the Committee the setting-up of recognized means for the evaluation of good teaching by each department is an essential first step to the adequate rewarding of good teaching in any institution of higher education.

Ratings by Students and Alumni

In the absence of such self-appraisal it is not surprising that college administrators should have turned to the only other means of differentiation which seemed to be at hand; namely, a questionnaire addressed

to students or alumni asking their opinions as to the relative competence of their teachers. Various institutions have tried to evaluate the teaching ability of men in their faculties by this means, but in no case with altogether satisfactory results so far as the Committee has been able to discover.

College professors as a rule do not object to having such inquiries addressed to their students. They realize that helpful suggestions toward the improvement of their work may often be obtained in this way. But they feel that they ought to have a voice with reference to the procedure followed, the kind of information sought, and the interpretation of the data collected. It is the opinion of the Committee, therefore, that student criticism and alumni ratings, as ascertained by heads of departments, deans, or presidents through the use of formal questionnaires, without the advice or consent of the instructors concerned, are not likely to be of any substantial value in differentiating good teachers from poor, or in raising the general level of teaching. The resentment which such inquiries are almost certain to produce will cause them to be virtually barren of helpful results. College administrators should have this fact strongly impressed upon them.

On the other hand the Committee feels that student and alumni criticism obtained for or by the instructor, with his approval and for his information, is likely to be of much value, and that the obtaining of such criticism at intervals is a procedure which may well be encouraged. This encouragement might take the form of having the college administration provide instructors with suitable questionnaire blanks for their use. At the same time the Committee would reiterate its opinion that the working-out of departmental criteria for the evaluation of teaching within each department will gain better results than any form of student or alumni ratings.

Non-Teaching Activities in Relation to Good Teaching

One frequently hears it said that a serious impediment to good teaching can be found in the excessive amount of committee work required from members of college faculties. Complaint is also made that poor teaching is frequently attributable to the multifarious extra-curricular activities in which college teachers sometimes engage, whether voluntarily or involuntarily. Such activities include the giving of extension and correspondence courses, outside speaking engagements which professors are urged to make as a service to the

institution, professional work closely related to a teacher's field of scholarship (such as the editing of a scientific periodical), remunerated outside employment (such as serving as an industrial consultant), and evening classes such as are held in some metropolitan institutions.

The investigations made by the Committee seem to indicate that committee work does not seriously interfere with the effectiveness of teaching save in very exceptional cases. The burden of committee work in most institutions is well distributed and where this is done it has a beneficial influence upon the teachers who share in it. Extension work appears to constitute an overload on the time of certain teachers in some institutions. If it does not impair the quality of their teaching it probably interferes with their activity in research. Unremunerated work which is closely connected to a teacher's field of scholarship (such as editing a scientific publication or holding office in a learned society) ought to be encouraged, and allowance made for it in the teaching load, because its reaction upon the teacher's other work is likely to be beneficial. Remunerated outside employment, if it takes much of a teacher's time, may be a serious distraction from what ought to be his main concern; but situations of this kind do not frequently arise in the great majority of universities and colleges. When such problems do arise, they may best be decided in each case individually rather than by general rule. Evening classes are now being held at several institutions and in some cases they have led to an overworking of the teaching staff. Such extra work, when superimposed upon a full schedule of regular teaching, is altogether likely to result in a lowering of quality. It is the Committee's opinion that extension courses, correspondence courses, and evening classes, as well as committee work within the institution if it is of any considerable amount, should be counted as part of the weekly teaching load and should be paid for within the teacher's regular salary rather than as extra compensation.

Courses in Education as Part of the College Teacher's Preparation

Is it likely that courses in education, if taken by those who are preparing to become college teachers, would result in better teaching? An affirmative answer to this question is frequently given by educationists, while most professors of academic subjects seem to hold a contrary view. The Committee has given a good deal of study to this question and has found that there are three general categories of

opinion with reference to it. In the first place there are some educationists who believe and urge that courses in education, particularly in practice-teaching, ought to be required in the case of everybody who expects to hold a teaching position at the college level. They would require such courses in connection with every candidacy for the Ph.D. degree.

But there are other educationists who would not go so far. Believing that such a requirement would be inadvisable at the present time, they merely ask that elective opportunities be provided for those graduate students who would like to take one or more courses in education as part of their study-programs for the master's or doctor's degree. Finally, there is a strong body of opinion, chiefly in the regular academic departments, that no relation between success in college teaching and the pursuit of courses in education has as yet been demonstrated, and that so long as this is the case there is no good reason why graduate students who intend to become college teachers should be either required or encouraged to take courses in education.

The Committee has not deemed it possible to reconcile these differences of opinion or even at present to suggest a reasonable compromise among them. It believes, however, that the best interests of higher education in the United States demand that some reconciliation of divergent views in this field should be earnestly sought. It believes that improvements in the technique of teaching can be best secured by cooperation between the educationist and the academic groups in the endeavor to reach common ground. The Committee is not disposed to recommend that, under present conditions, those who are preparing for the profession of college teaching should be either required or encouraged to take formal courses in education. It does feel, on the other hand, that institutions of higher education should direct an adequate amount of effort toward the getting of such information as will assist college teachers to improve their own methods.

What is needed, much more than any prescription of courses in education, is the pursuit of studies which will accomplish three things: First, the acquainting of every college teacher with the newest developments in the field of higher education presented in relation to the whole history of education in the United States; second, the gathering of materials with reference to the methods of instruction in individual departments such as will enable criteria of good teaching

to be worked out; third, the vigorous study of everything that can throw any light on the processes of learning by college students. Teaching and learning are parts of the same picture. It is sometimes said, and it is probably true, that there are more students in American colleges who have difficulty in learning than there are teachers who have difficulty in teaching.

In the opinion of the Committee one of the fundamental questions which ought to have the attention of the entire body of college professors at the present moment is this: Are we who are active teachers of the academic subjects, and the ones most concerned with the effective teaching of these subjects, ready to assert our leadership and to participate in the discussion of how these subjects can best be taught, or are we going to sit on the side-lines and leave the whole discussion to administrative officers, our colleagues in schools, and departments of education?

That such matters will be discussed, studied, written about, and generalized upon by somebody is inevitable. The question is by whom and from what point of view. Accordingly the Committee desires to emphasize as strongly as it can the duty and obligation of the whole profession to acquaint itself, and to encourage its younger members to become acquainted, with the general organization and problems of higher education in the United States, to promote every investigation which seems likely to result in our knowing more about the processes of learning, and to work out wherever practicable some plan which will enable the teachers in each department to determine whether they are really attaining the ends which they may agree upon as desirable. In such matters the counsel and cooperation of our colleagues in departments and schools of education can be of real value.

One specific step, moreover, the Committee is prepared to suggest to universities and colleges at the present stage; namely, that when a department's personnel is large enough, and where students are being prepared to become college teachers, there ought to be in the department at least one member who is especially interested in the problem of teaching. It should be his duty to take the lead in promoting the discussion of teaching methods within the department; he should be the adviser of those students who expect to enter the profession of college teaching, and he should make himself familiar with their teaching experience and capacity. Such a member of the department might also be expected to interest his immediate colleagues in the gathering of materials and the working-out of a pro-

cedure whereby the effectiveness of their own teaching could be by themselves determined.

College professors sometimes forget that they are expected to function in a threefold capacity. They are teachers of youth, and as such are expected to impart knowledge efficiently. They are also charged with the duty of widening the bounds of learning by their own research and scholarly exploration. And they have the third obligation of sharing in the direction of collegiate educational policy. It is their task to determine what shall be taught in the colleges, and how, and to whom. They decide the qualifications for admission to college, the scope and nature of the curriculum, the standards of student scholarship, and the requirements for graduation. This is a high responsibility to which members of college faculties have not always risen.

College administrators frequently complain that many members of their faculties become too engrossed in their own special fields of interest and look at the broader problems of higher education solely from the standpoint of their own departments. Too often, it is said, they know and care nothing about what is going on in other institutions, or even in other departments of their own institution. If there are any grounds for such complaints the Committee believes that they will be removed if college administrators actively encourage the discussion of general educational problems at meetings of their faculties. Such discussions are not more frequently initiated by members of college faculties because of a feeling, in many institutions, that the administrative authorities do not welcome the full and frank expression of professorial opinions which would be the outcome. If local chapters of the American Association of University Professors would plan to devote each year a series of meetings to the discussion of timely issues connected with college organization, policy, and methods, it would also be of value, especially to the younger members.

The Newer Methods of Instruction

The methods of instruction used in American universities and colleges have been undergoing a considerable change during the past quarter of a century. The lecture system of teaching has fallen into great disfavor. Large classes have been reduced in size by splitting them into sections. A vigorous attempt has been made to bring instructor and student into closer touch with one another. Everywhere there seems to be a firm conviction among college teachers,

college students, and college administrators that teaching can be better done in small classes than in large ones. The idea has been pressed so far, in some cases, that small groups of undergraduates are tacitly assumed to be better taught by young, immature instructors or teaching fellows than they would be if they were thrown into larger classes and taught by older and more experienced members of the faculty. Opinions as to the superiority of the small section over the large class seem to be firmly and widely held irrespective of the subject which is being taught or the maturity of the students concerned. College administrators realize that the cost of this instruction in small classes is very large, but most of them believe that the increased expenditure is justified by the results.

This conclusion, however, does not appear to rest upon any basis of results actually tested and ascertained. Investigations have been made at several institutions with the idea of discovering whether the instruction given by the same teacher in small classes is more efficient than that given by him in larger ones. In such cases a negative or inconclusive finding has been the usual outcome. No careful study of the subject, so far as the Committee can discover, has thus far demonstrated that the splitting of large classes into small sections is worth the large expenditure which this practice entails. It is quite possible, of course, that this failure to prove the superiority of the small-section method is due to the inadequacy of the studies which have thus far been made. Or it may be that the method has certain values of an imponderable nature which cannot be measured by any kind of formal result-testing.

The Committee is not ready to venture any opinion on the main issue. It does, however, call attention to the fact that the widespread belief in the superiority of the small-class method has not been fortified by any adequate investigation of the actual results. The matter is one which ought to be thoroughly studied before the present policy of small-group instruction becomes stereotyped through the planning of classroom buildings. Such a study might conceivably show that the plan has marked advantages in the teaching of some subjects, but none at all, or almost none, in the teaching of others. It might indicate that the advantages are greater, or less, in elementary than in more advanced courses. Assuredly the subject deserves a full and fair exploration, for unless it can be demonstrated that instruction can be given with distinctly better results in small groups than in large classes, the great expenditures now being

made by universities and colleges to maintain the former method of instruction have no justification.

Trustworthy information on this issue is of particular urgency at the present moment because universities and colleges have undergone a shrinkage in their annual income. They are finding it essential to cut down their budgets by reducing the teaching staff, increasing the weekly teaching-load, and cutting salaries. It is probable that the quest for economies will also result in doubling-up the sections. And this policy of increasing the size of classes is likely to be put into effect wherever resistance is least, in other words at points where it may be least desirable from the standpoint of good instruction.

The Committee recommends, therefore, that a special study be undertaken by the Association without delay to ascertain just where increases in the size of college classes can be made with the least detriment to the interests of instruction, whether in elementary or in advanced work, whether in some departments but not in others, and whether some compromise through the substitution of lectures for a part of the classroom discussions, without replacing them entirely, can be worked out to advantage under the stress of present conditions. The Association should seek adequate funds for making this study.

Experiments in the Technique of Teaching

Numerous experiments with new instructional devices are being carried on in institutions all over the country. These include the introduction of such innovations as comprehensive examinations of varied types with or without external examiners, the setting up of general and special courses for honors, the use of tutors or preceptors, the establishment of "reading courses" or "free periods for reading," the working out of "group majors" which cut across the usual departmental lines, and the use of "new-type tests" in place of the usual examinations.

To these new developments in the technique of college teaching the Committee has devoted a share of its attention. Its general conclusion is that all of the above-named experiments have value and promise, but that none of them has yet been tried for a sufficiently long time and under sufficiently varied conditions to prove its value for general use. The comprehensive examination, for example, has unquestionably proved its merit in certain institutions where a well-organized tutorial system has been created to help prepare students for these examinations. External examiners are being successfully

employed in some cases and it seems to be now apparent that most of the benefits arising from the use of these external examiners can be achieved without bringing them from other institutions. The essential thing is that the examiner shall be external as far as the particular class or instructor is concerned. He need not be external to the institution or even to the department in which the examination is being taken. In other words he may be secured from the same department or from a closely related department in the same institution.

In the matter of honors courses the survey conducted by the Committee has uncovered a wide variation in methods and results. There are almost as many different arrangements for honors courses as there are institutions experimenting with them. One thing, however, has already become apparent; namely, that honors courses cannot be made a success if the work of directing the students enrolled in such courses is loaded upon members of the teaching staff as an addition to their regular teaching schedules. Directing the work of candidates for honors courses is a time-consuming task. It necessitates frequent conferences with the individual students involved. This means that if the policy of stimulating the best undergraduates to pursue honors courses or independent reading courses is to work out successfully, the colleges must either enlarge their teaching staffs and spend considerable money in doing this, or they must be prepared to reduce the number of formal courses now given so that the existing personnel will have time to take charge of the additional work.

The same is true of tutorial work and other projects for the individualizing of instruction. If tutorial instruction is made worth while it becomes expensive. Good tutoring is more difficult than good classroom teaching. Hence good tutors will cost a college as much as good instructors, or more. This does not mean, however, that universities and colleges need feel themselves precluded by reason of this expense from supplementing their formal instruction by some plan of tutorial conferences. The cost can probably be met by institutions if they are ready to halt the continued creation of new departments and the further expansion of their regular curricula.

It is the Committee's belief, therefore, that the continuance of these experiments under a variety of conditions is desirable during the next few years in order that a sufficient body of data relating to their value can be brought together and carefully studied. There

is no reason to expect that either now or in the future any single plan or device of instruction can be recommended to all institutions for use by them in all departments and under all circumstances. The methods that seem best adapted to each must be discovered by the process of trial and error. This process is now being extensively carried on. It should be closely followed and the results scrutinized with care. Serious errors are likely to be made if institutions fall into the habit of indiscriminately adopting methods which seemingly have proved successful elsewhere but the merits and shortcomings of which have not been fully investigated with reference to their adaptability.

A Word in Conclusion

This is a progress report, not a statement of definitive opinions or final conclusions. Whatever has been set forth as the judgment or belief of the Committee is tentative and subject to revision before its final report is agreed upon. The members of the Committee, in fact, have not made it their primary aim to arrive at definite findings, but rather to search out issues and problems that seem to require a good deal of discussion and careful investigation before any conclusion concerning them can be safely reached.

Furthermore, while the Committee believes that good teaching is highly important, it does not believe that mere improvements in teaching will of themselves provide a solution for all the problems, or even for the most important problems, which now confront the college and university faculties of the United States. Even more urgent, for example, than the need for higher standards of teaching is the need for higher standards of scholastic work on the part of the American undergraduate. Teaching can never be highly effective until a greater degree of intellectual response and cooperation is expected and exacted from the student body.

The measure of scholastic achievement now required in undergraduate work, taking American universities and colleges as a whole, is altogether too low. It varies, moreover, from one department to another within the same institution, or from one course to another within the same department, to such an extent that those teachers who try to maintain high standards find themselves handicapped by the mediocrity of performance to which their students have elsewhere become habituated. One of the essential prerequisites of improved teaching, therefore, is the elimination of low-standard courses from college catalogues.

The Committee recognizes the importance of this and other fundamental problems, but it has not felt that such matters as the level of undergraduate scholarship, the organization of college curricula, the relation of the college to the secondary schools, or the safeguarding of study from the distractions of campus activities come within the scope of its survey. Some of these problems have been studied in the past by other committees of the Association. All of them are worthy of whatever further attention may be bestowed upon them by this or any other interested organization.

Meanwhile the present Committee on College and University Teaching hopes that its mission will not be misunderstood. Its studies necessarily cover but a small part of a very large field. It presents in this "Progress Report" the discussion of certain practical problems of timely interest which seem to be closely connected with the improvement of college teaching—problems which can be discussed without raising basic questions of educational purpose that carry far afield. Although strongly pressed to do so, the Committee has not felt warranted in allowing itself to be diverted from the task that was specifically assigned to it, even for the consideration of matters which many college professors regard as of more fundamental importance to the cause of higher education than the improvement of teaching itself.

For the Committee,
WILLIAM B. MUNRO, *Chairman*

EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION¹

A SELF-STUDY OF COLLEGE TEACHING²

The criticism, of course, will be raised that this is a subjective way of going at the problem and disregards the customary "techniques of an objective nature" which have been developed by expert educationists. The answer is that for many years the art of college teaching has been surveyed and resurveyed, usually with different results each time, by the use of complicated techniques, some of which have been quite unintelligible to the great body of college professors. The energy put forth in this way has been out of all proportion to the tangible results. This is not altogether surprising, for no body of professional men will blandly accept findings which have been reached by a procedure which they do not approve and often do not understand. Any improvement in the quality of college teaching, if it is to be secured at all, must be obtained by methods which have the consent and cooperation of the teachers themselves. It cannot be successfully imposed upon them against their own judgment.

This does not mean, however, that the educationists are not counted upon for a substantial contribution toward the solution of this problem. They can contribute a great deal. On many questions it has already become apparent that there is no substantial difference between the convictions of professors in the academic departments and those in the schools of education.

In a study of this kind, certain fundamental, and perhaps unanswerable, questions come up at the very outset. What is good teaching? What is the good teacher's objective? How do you know whether his goal is the right one and whether he is attaining it? Good teaching, of course, is impossible to define except by saying that it is the kind of teaching which gains the end desired, and there are as many objectives in teaching as there are subjects to be taught. Moreover, there may be both immediate and ultimate objectives, and most of the so-termed "tests of good teaching" which educationists have thus far devised have only the former in mind.

One frequently hears it asserted that the quality of the teaching now being done in American universities and colleges is poor, and

¹ The articles in this section are reprinted from the *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. III, No. 9.

² Abridged from article in *Journal of Higher Education*, in view of partial duplication with "Progress Report" in this issue.

indeed inexcusably poor, but no convincing evidence to support this assertion is brought forth. Questionnaires have been sent to large bodies of undergraduate students by college administrators asking them to rate the efficiency of their teachers, and the results have sometimes been paraded as indicating how much the quality of teaching leaves to be desired.

The real issue, however, is not as to how much the quality of college teaching falls below perfection in the undergraduate mind, but whether or not it is as good as it ought to be under existing conditions and in view of the serious difficulties, some of which are due to the mediocrity of the average undergraduate himself.

Incidentally, it might be suggested that college administrators, in sending these questionnaires to students with a request for an appraisal of their teachers, might try the experiment of asking them also to rate the non-teaching activities of the institution—the registrar's office, the efficiency of the deans, the quality of the food served in the college dining halls; they might even muster up enough courage to seek the undergraduate reaction toward the president's office. It is within the bounds of possibility that college teaching would not suffer acutely by such a comparison.

There is no substantial ground for believing that college teaching at the present time is on the whole inferior to high school teaching or to the teaching that is done in professional institutions. On the other hand, there must be, in the nature of things, plenty of room for its improvement. The problem is to find out not what could be done if our whole system of higher education were changed or if huge sums of money were available, but what can be accomplished with the resources that are at hand. It does not carry far toward a solution to say that if professors were paid twice as much we would get men of broader culture and more compelling personality into the ranks of the professoriate—at least, it does not carry far under existing economic conditions. Nor does it avail much to argue that better teaching could be done if university and college teachers were not required to waste their energies on brigades of low-voltage mentalities which should never have been admitted to college at all. The problem is to discover, if one can, what measures and methods are apt to be most fruitful of helpfulness under the circumstances as they are.

Most institutions profess to place successful teaching on the same basis as achievement in research, but it is doubtful whether such

a policy can be fully carried out under existing conditions. Good research work gets itself promptly appreciated by scientific journals and by learned societies, while good teaching does not. The surest channel of rapid promotion in any large institution is a call to go elsewhere, and such invitations are in almost every instance the result of a teacher's research activities. No matter how excellent a professor's classroom work may be he cannot expect to gain a high reputation among his colleagues at other institutions by that alone. If the good teacher does not get recognition from his own college, he is likely to get it nowhere.

The rigid research requirements for the Ph.D. degree which are maintained by the graduate schools have been blamed for much of the poor teaching in colleges. But the fact that only about one-third of all the teachers in the liberal-arts colleges of the United States are Doctors of Philosophy would seem to indicate that the onus needs another guess. It is also urged that the graduate schools should give training of a different sort to those who expect to enter the teaching profession in institutions of higher education. They should become, as some would have it, super-normal schools. But the graduate schools are not likely to do anything of the kind until it can be shown beyond peradventure that teacher-training courses do in fact conduce to more effective teaching on the part of those who have pursued them.

So far as college instruction is concerned there is unhappily no proof that this is now the case. On the contrary, it is notorious that the instruction given by teachers in departments of education is nowhere regarded by the student body, nor has it been demonstrated by any valid objective tests, to be of better quality than that given in the general run of academic courses by teachers who have had no training in educational psychology, educational technique, methods of teaching, and so forth. Various answers have been given to this question by the educationists but they are not all-satisfying.

The problem of good teaching, moreover, because of the large number of variables with which it is concerned, can probably never be settled with any degree of finality. But there are certain possibilities of immediate and promising interest which can be explored, and it is on these that the Committee is concentrating its attention. Among them are questions relating to the recruiting of the profession, the teaching-load, alumni ratings, the pressure of committee work, extension work and outside employment, the use of comprehen-

sive examinations with or without external examiners, tutorial conferences, honors courses, free reading periods and group majors, the use of new-type tests to determine the efficiency of teaching, sectioning on the basis of ability, the feasibility of interdepartmental conferences for the discussion of teaching, and the giving of better guidance by older teachers to their younger colleagues.

The chief value in a study of this type is not to be found in the conclusions or recommendations which come from it but in the amount of discussion that it arouses. Nothing ever undertaken by the American Association of University Professors has been more successful in stirring up discussion among its members than this survey.

WILLIAM B. MUNRO

THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING

For many years the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools enforced rigorously the standards adopted in earlier years describing the supposed characteristics of an efficient college. From time to time, minor revisions of the standards were adopted, but, in the main, the Commission followed faithfully the judgments of its founders. Gradually, confidence in the accepted standards weakened. As far back as 1915, an official report, based on statements made by the colleges, showed that there was a general disregard in the larger institutions of the standard limiting college classes to thirty. Skepticism was frequently expressed in the Commission as to the justification for accepting conformity to the standard on endowment as a surer basis for approval of a college than conformity to some of the standards dealing with less tangible qualities. Skepticism was also expressed regarding the defensibility of the standard which emphasized higher degrees possessed by members of the faculty as guaranties of efficient teaching. Finally, skepticism grew so intense that the Commission created a committee to make a thorough study of all standards and to recommend, if possible, new bases for accrediting institutions. This committee secured a staff and is working energetically toward the solution of the problem set for it.

The gradual change in attitude of the Commission of the North Central Association is paralleled by a growing demand in many quarters for a re-study of the organization and methods of instruction

in all institutions of higher education of the United States. The present economic stringency, with its consequent general movement in the direction of retrenchment, has greatly reinforced the tendency to question traditional practices. It is highly probable that the near future will see the adoption of many new ideas regarding the organization of colleges and universities. Quite certainly, the rapid expansion of material equipment and of college faculties, which has been going on for some years, is at an end. A more effective use of facilities now possessed by institutions will have to be worked out.

The meaning of the foregoing statement may, perhaps, be made clearer by an example. A canvass recently made of the course offerings of ten representative, independent liberal-arts colleges and ten liberal-arts divisions of representative universities showed that the average numbers of courses offered at various periods were as follows: 1900, 217; 1910, 338; 1920, 445; 1930, 605. A part of the expansion here indicated can be explained as due to the new materials made available by productive scholarship, but, for the most part, the additions to course offerings are due to a combination of intensive specialization and competition stimulated by the elective system. The tendency to counteract specialization and unlimited extension of the elective system was beginning to make itself manifest long before the present financial stringency. In other words, the educational inappropriateness of indefinite expansion was becoming evident even before the financial impossibility of supporting this expansion was impressed on the public mind. No one can look into the future without realizing that consolidation of courses is sure to come. No discriminating student of education can fail to recognize that consolidation is desirable from every point of view.

It is not merely financial economy which dictates a reexamination of the plans of education in operation in this country. Charles W. Eliot pointed out in 1888 that the American student is two years behind his European contemporaries in intellectual maturity. Eliot described the disastrous consequences of this condition for professional training and advanced scholarship. Some reforms have been effected since 1888, but the fact still remains that the educational system of this country is less efficient in conserving the time of pupils than it should be.

Members of academic faculties are accustomed to attribute the lack of efficiency in American colleges and universities to the inade-

quate preparation of students. There is, unfortunately, too much justification for the criticism that the lower schools are not as efficient as they should be. This fact should not blind college faculties, however, to their own failure to cope with the problems which they and their students encounter in college. It is a frequently repeated and generally accepted criticism of college teaching that it does not cultivate independence in intellectual pursuits in students. It is not infrequently admitted that much college instruction is dull and unstimulating, that not a few college teachers come to class ill prepared, that teaching is, in many instances, casual and repetitious. If these charges are true, and no one doubts that they are, the colleges should see to it that domestic troubles are cleared up before they spend energy in calling attention to the deficiencies of other institutions.

It is a curious fact that, while most members of college faculties accept without objection criticisms of standardizing associations, of the organization of departments other than their own, of secondary schools, and of their shiftless or incompetent colleagues, they resist to the utmost any effort to bring them individually into court to answer to the charges lodged against the educational system. It is the habit of academic life to pretend such complete preoccupation with the affairs of pure contemplative scholarship that one cannot give much attention to the trivialities of college organization or to the task of studying methods of correcting defects in this organization.

Not only do members of college faculties refuse to take responsibility for the inadequacies of college organization, but they usually reject dogmatically the suggestions which are made by those who attempt to plan in their behalf and thus to save their institutions from disruption. A striking illustration of what is here said appeared at the last meeting of the North Central Association. As pointed out in an earlier paragraph, it has long been known in the Association that the standard on class-size is generally neglected. Not only so, but through the enlightened and energetic experimental study of the problem of class-size at the University of Minnesota, a member of the Association, much evidence has been supplied that the standards should be abrogated. At the last meeting of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, it was voted, after years of consideration, to abolish the standard on class-size. Such is the conservatism of the academic mind, not to say its stolid devotion to tradition and dogma, that the Association, on being notified of the

action of the Commission, asked that the whole problem be reconsidered before the abolition of the standard is made effective.

If members of college faculties will not give time to the solution of college problems, and if they will not let any one solve their problems for them, some kind of forcible measures will have to be taken. It will be unfortunate if persistence in the "do-nothing" attitude results, as it has in some quarters, in the solution of academic problems by legislatures and lay boards of trustees. One may view, with such alarm as one's temperament permits, the action of legislatures dictating to state universities whom they shall admit as students, but the fact remains that some one has to decide how a democratic society is to be conducted. If academic scholars will not take a hand in the conduct of democracy, the representatives of the people, however incompetent they may be to do so, will.

Some such considerations must have operated in somebody's mind to bring about the organization of a committee of the American Association of University Professors to make a study of college teaching. The testimony of the present writer as a member of that committee can be given to the effect that the reactions of some of the members of the academic world to the proposal that their performances be studied are varied and not infrequently scornfully adverse. One can suggest with all propriety the study of any subject about which a college professor can think, from plants to governments, but the professor himself and his forms of behavior are regarded by many members of the fraternity as so far above the level of common life that one must not study them. Letters come to members of the Committee on College and University Teaching telling of meetings of chapters of the Association where comments on the very existence of such a committee are made which will hardly bear repeating.

It may not be out of place, therefore, for one who joined the Committee with great reluctance, because of his known disposition to submit all educational processes to scientific investigation, to offer a few soothing comments to allay the disturbed emotions of some members of the academic profession who prefer to follow their accustomed ways and object to any threat of inquiries which will compel them to think about college organization or teaching in new ways.

Before entering on the proposed attempt at mollification of objectors, it may be well to state explicitly that the subsequent remarks

have no sanction other than that of the personal opinion of the writer. The chairman of the Committee on College and University Teaching, in accepting the suggestion that there be a symposium prepared for this Journal, made the express stipulation that no one should attempt, even remotely, to represent the Committee. The opinions of the Committee are in the making; they have not been formulated.

It is not the expectation of the present writer that the Committee on College and University Teaching will invade the classrooms of any of the members of the Association, nor that standard tests will be applied either to professors or to their students. The Committee is full of caution. It will ask such innocent questions as these: Does the administration of a given institution recognize good teaching? If so, how? If not, why not?

The questions thus asked make it possible for any faculty member who wishes to do so to evade altogether the discussion of what constitutes good teaching and to enter into a voluble tirade on the incompetency of his dean, or president, or even of the head of his department. It is possible that the mental exercise induced in the effort to discover the extent to which a given institution recognizes, or does not recognize, good teaching may lead some persons to consider either sooner or later what are the criteria by which one can recognize good teaching.

Some years ago the Yale college faculty received the report of a committee which had used an interesting device to discover something about the teaching in the classes of that institution. The committee had calculated the general averages of all the students registered in each class. It had thus been able to distinguish sharply between those courses in which low-grade students congregated in great numbers and the courses which were attended predominantly by high-grade students. The committee made an impressive showing for the intelligence of students. It is certainly true that students know which instructor presents material that is of value. To be sure, even good students sometimes accept opportunities for relaxation, but it is fairly easy to find the best teachers in an institution by following the best students.

Other institutions have adopted other devices, such as consultation with recent graduates or with seniors who are so near their departure that they are willing to give a frank judgment. It is not the expectation of the present writer that the Committee on College and Univer-

sity Teaching is going to try to locate good teachers by any of these devices or by other devices, however likely they are to give valid results. The Committee is merely going to ask whether any one has tried to find a way of discovering good and bad teachers. The Committee is interested in securing a count of the institutions that have devised ways of finding what kind of teaching is being carried on under their auspices.

Some years ago one of the principals of the High School of Commerce in New York City kept a cumulative record showing, from year to year, what became of the pupils taught by each teacher. It was easily possible to tell from this record what teacher inspired his pupils with interest. The pupils of such a teacher went on in large numbers into the elective courses in that teacher's field. There were other teachers whose pupils never elected advanced courses.

The Committee on College and University Teaching is anxious to discover whether any dean or head of a department, or college president keeps any kind of record which will reveal the qualities of teachers. It is said that much of President Eliot's knowledge about the Harvard faculty was derived from the examinations which the members of the faculty set for their students. It is interesting to note in this connection that a committee of mathematicians is using a device similar to that used by President Eliot. The mathematicians have asked a number of their colleagues to send them the examinations—questions and answers—from their regular courses. An analysis of the questions makes clear the kind of instructional content the teacher regards as important and an analysis of the answers shows what the students learned in the course.

The Committee on College and University Teaching did not deem it desirable to undertake any such study as the mathematicians are making. This Committee will be glad to learn of any devices invented by institutions trying to understand themselves which are as intelligent as those being used by the mathematicians.

Teaching is always paralleled when it is well done by efforts to direct students in the choice of subjects suited to their capacities and to the careers to which they are looking forward. In many colleges the expectation that members of the faculty will take time to advise students has been abandoned, and more or less elaborate independent advisory systems have been set up. It is the hope of the Committee on College and University Teaching that suitable publicity with regard to the operations of well-organized and well-conducted per-

sonnel advisory divisions of colleges may prove stimulating to institutions which have not seen the wisdom of organizing such divisions. In other words, the Committee is interested not only in devices designed to discover good teachers but in devices which create in institutions using them the spirit which will aid good teachers in their work.

The Committee is interested in any plans of promotion of faculty members which will stimulate young teachers to believe that good teaching is regarded favorably in institutions of higher education. There is unemployment in academic ranks. The future promises to see vigorous competition for the attractive places in college faculties. It is important for men contemplating entrance on academic careers to learn what types of activity are likely to lead to advancement.

In short, and by way of summary, let it be understood that the work of the Committee on College and University Teaching is not likely to disturb those who are uninterested. It may help to create a generation of young teachers and administrators who will be vitally concerned with the problems of teaching. It may give satisfaction to older members of college faculties who have been trying to improve methods of teaching and administration. Above all, it is likely to lay the foundations for a long-continued study of college problems which will some day make it possible to discuss the operations of colleges with scientific understanding equal to that now exhibited in discussing the organization of savage tribes, of the family, or of the governments of civilized nations.

CHARLES H. JUDD

THE IMPROVEMENT OF COLLEGE TEACHING

The improvement of college teaching has been the subject of a study conducted during the past year by a committee of the American Association of University Professors. Visits to forty-five colleges and universities and the reports and the letters received from chapters and individuals in other institutions have familiarized the writer with the opinions and experiences of a large portion of the membership of the Association. The present article is not a formal or comprehensive report of this work; it merely presents some of the writer's personal convictions after having discussed the problem of college teaching with several hundred of the most interested members of the profession.

Obstacles to Improvement in Teaching

Perhaps the most serious obstacle to improvement in college teaching is the failure of many administrators and college professors to face thoughtfully and honestly the responsibilities which they and their institutions have to society at large and to their students. Some have very hazy ideas concerning these responsibilities and are satisfied with catering to alumni, to wealthy patrons, or to groups whose favor they seek. Others, having no regard for legitimate objectives, are openly striving to make their institutions something which they were never intended to be. Universities are striving to be research institutes. Colleges are trying to become universities. Four-year colleges are struggling along as second-rate institutions when they could better serve as first-rate junior colleges. Normal schools become teachers colleges in name, and, before they have had time to develop a college program, begin offering graduate instruction. Agricultural colleges enter the too-crowded field of liberal-arts education instead of filling the crying need for a type of vocational training now furnished by few institutions.

When the problems of a college or university are considered, it is often in terms of the number of students, finances, student discipline, athletics, and alumni or other "influence." Rarely does one hear discussions of how the institution can fulfill its obligations to the social order and how it can best contribute to the lives of the students who should properly be admitted to it. In the absence of clear, straightforward thinking about the real purposes of institutions of higher learning, it is not surprising that there should be such confusion with regard to the whole problem of instruction.

As a result of this confusion, teaching has been relegated to a subordinate position in favor of research. It is easy to see how this has happened. Research is a legitimate interest; it commands one's best talents; success in it can be readily measured; and, partly as a consequence of this ease in measurement, it has usually led to greater fame and financial reward than teaching. Research or, to use an expression which does not lend itself so readily to narrow interpretation, productive scholarship is an essential part of any program of collegiate instruction. One of its functions, although not the only one, is the contribution which it can make to the work of instruction. Yet every one knows that in many institutions it has been given first

place and that it is the practice of the faculties to neglect teaching when it interferes with research.

The responsibility for this situation rests squarely upon those who determine departmental policies. The condition is aggravated by the influence of the national learned societies which, with few exceptions, have concerned themselves solely with research. In some instances they have actually been antagonistic toward consideration of general problems of instruction and commonly have cultivated the attitude that college teaching is merely a means of earning one's living while devoting the bulk of one's time and energy to research. Heads of departments, ambitious for favorable showing at national meetings and in the journals, throw the energy of the departments into research and publication. Scores of departments can be cited which put so little vitality into the elementary teaching that few students become interested enough in the subject to take the advanced undergraduate courses. The students in such departments are, for the most part, elementary students who are required to take the courses and graduate students who have come from smaller institutions where there is often a genuine devotion to teaching which calls forth a lively interest in the subject.

Although the foregoing remarks apply more particularly to institutions having graduate schools, the effect of the policies which have been described has been felt in the colleges. This has been forcefully brought out by the reports of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers of the Association of American Colleges. Too frequently the teachers in our colleges and universities secure their graduate training, which is their preparation for work as teachers, in an atmosphere where teaching is looked down upon. Those who go to large institutions become a part of the system and secure advancement for accomplishment in research rather than for excellence in teaching. Those who go to colleges find that their training falls far short of preparing them for their work. Some of the latter are keenly interested in teaching and adapt themselves immediately; others suffer from lack of understanding of the simplest rudiments of teaching and never become completely adjusted. The subordination of teaching to research has been one of the most serious obstacles to the improvement of teaching.

Inhibitions resulting from academic tradition constitute further obstacles to the improvement of teaching. Men who are working on the frontiers of knowledge in their own fields, and who are accus-

tomed to adjusting themselves to this new knowledge, cling tenaciously to traditional habits of thought when their work as teachers is concerned. Many of them refuse to cooperate when farsighted administrators wish to experiment with innovations which promise to correct the very conditions about which the professors complain.

To cite some of the less complicated questions which have come up in the study: Why is there the prejudice against the visiting of classes for the purpose of assisting the teacher in the improvement of his work? Why should not student criticism of courses and teachers be welcome and even sought for? Why should college professors feel that they must be "called" to positions instead of being given an opportunity to apply for them? The traditional answers are that "the professor's classroom is his castle," "students sit at the feet of their professors," and "a professor occupies a chair to which he is called." When teaching becomes of vital concern to our colleges and universities and a thing for which departments strive and which administrations reward, it will be discovered that there are already at hand many devices which can be immediately made use of for its improvement.

Current Trends and Experiments

A change from the attitudes described in the foregoing paragraphs is already occurring in some quarters. The growing willingness to reconsider the problems of collegiate education, especially a willingness to experiment, is most promising for the improvement of teaching. Institutions are taking stock of themselves and questioning their work; departments are beginning to realize that good teaching is an essential part of a successful program. One of the most striking examples of a large-scale experiment is the new plan at the University of Chicago where the importance of teaching is being definitely recognized in the "College." The Junior College of the University of Minnesota has recently been organized to satisfy needs which have become apparent through educational studies conducted there. Bennington College has opened its doors this fall after several years of careful preparation. A dozen other institutions could be cited whose names bring to mind important experiments. In some of these the experimental stage has already been passed, and the resulting methods are being adopted by others.

Perhaps the most important trends are, curiously enough, toward the two extremes of individualized instruction and instruction in large

groups. In all parts of the country interest is being shown in providing opportunities for students to work independently upon problems that interest them and to receive individual attention from instructors. Tutorial plans as at Harvard, honors courses as at Swarthmore, conferences as at Rollins, and reading courses as at Vanderbilt, all are different expressions of this aim.

As a part of such programs the comprehensive examination is frequently utilized. This type of examination furnishes incentives for the student which formerly did not exist. For example, it encourages wide reading and provides many of the advantages of the "external examiner." In fact, honors courses are on the wane except where vitalized by the comprehensive examination. This illustrates the obvious, though seldom recognized, principle that educational projects must be thought through in all their implications. No simple formula can be expected to yield results unless put into operation in connection with all changes necessary to make it effective.

At the very time that experience has been emphasizing the necessity for tutorial or small-group instruction to accomplish certain results, it has been demonstrated by experiments, such as those at the University of Minnesota, that there are types of instruction that can be given effectively in large groups. This is a fortunate discovery, for if small classes, conference groups, and individual tutoring are to be provided where experience justifies them, economies must be effected elsewhere. Work at different levels and in different fields must be subjected to the most careful study in order to determine where mass instruction can be employed without materially reducing the effectiveness of the work. If the colleges are to ask society to support a more individualized type of instruction, college professors must be willing to learn the technique of handling large groups of students in such work as can be adapted to that method.

Savings can also be effected by coordinating the work of related departments and by throwing the emphasis on fields rather than on departments. This will, of course, be accompanied by a paring down of the number of courses, a move which is not necessarily to be regretted.

Functional Reorganization

One of the greatest obstacles to the improvement of teaching will be removed as soon as it is generally recognized that the dividing line between the four-year undergraduate program and the pro-

fessional or graduate school is an artificial one, whereas there is a real gap between what now constitutes the sophomore year and the junior year. This gap should mark the close of general education. The lower division, or "college" organization, in which teaching should be emphasized, will be sharply differentiated from the higher division where productive scholarship must always be paramount. Students going into the professional school or upper division will be a highly selected group, capable of adapting themselves to the type of instruction given by professors whose major interest is in subject-matter and research.

Experience with junior colleges has already demonstrated that it is feasible for the lower division to recognize the different needs of those who go on and those who do not. There is, however, the danger that the lower division may be dictated to, and controlled by, the upper division to an unreasonable extent. On the other hand, there is the danger that the lower division may concern itself too lightly with the needs of those who take further work. The almost universal conviction of college professors, even those whose primary interest is in teaching, is that instruction beyond the secondary school cannot be satisfactorily conducted unless the faculty is engaged in productive scholarly work. Many remain unconvinced that the lower division should be considered a part of the secondary-school program, and this group will regard as unfortunate any wholesale creation of separate junior colleges and, especially, the attachment to the high school of a year or two of so-called college work.

Whatever may be the final outcome of this situation, it is to be hoped that there will always remain a large and influential group of institutions in which the lower division continues to be associated with upper-division and graduate work. Here the teachers in the lower division will not be cut off from the benefits of companionship with scholars, association with active research work, and some participation in the teaching of more advanced courses. Indeed, such influences have so important an effect upon college teaching that it is highly desirable that four-year colleges which are fully able to finance such a program should in a few strong departments develop graduate work leading to the master's degree.

The ideal program for larger institutions promises to be similar to that toward which the University of Chicago is working. The issue everywhere, as it seems to be at Chicago, will be whether in an atmosphere of graduate study and research it will be possible to reward

successful teaching in the college as research is rewarded in the upper division.

As has been suggested earlier in this article, the answer rests largely with the departments. Unless departments prove themselves capable of maintaining a balanced emphasis upon teaching and research, and of recognizing the different functions and requirements of the work in the lower and upper divisions, it will be necessary to create separate departments in the "college." Such a result will be harmful to work at both levels. No matter how many separate junior colleges must be established, they should have constantly before them the examples of lower divisions of colleges and universities operated in close cooperation with senior and graduate units. Independent junior colleges may be capable of determining for themselves what constitutes a proper ending for general education, but it is reasonable to expect that the leadership, as far as preparation for advanced work is concerned, should come from institutions in which the lower-division work is carried on by teachers in close contact with, or participating in, research and advanced study.

The Rôle of the Department

In a log jam, where everything is at cross-purposes, there is somewhere a key log causing the trouble. The key log in the educational jam is the department, and the things which have caused it to make so much trouble are narrow departmental ambition and excessive striving for reputation through the publication of research. If departments will correlate their work with other departments, cease bidding for students by lowering standards, and exhibit the same enthusiasm for teaching that they have shown for research, the jam will be broken.

As an essential part of such a program, academic departments must add to, or develop, in their staffs men who are experts in teaching, as well as trained in the field. To such men the guidance of prospective teachers will be confided. A few hours spent in substantial courses in education and in acquiring training in the methods appropriate to the subject will be recognized as an essential part of the student's program. That genuine research should always be required for a graduate degree is questioned by no one; until a man has made an original contribution he has not entered the society of scholars. It is possible, however, that a person whose interests lead him in the direction

of college teaching might well make his contribution in the field of improving the teaching of the subject instead of in the subject-matter itself.

In this picture the department, school, or college, of education takes its rightful place. In the field of technical education it will function as a subject-matter department, or like a professional college such as engineering. In the field of teacher training it will be a service department to which students can be sent for courses in educational psychology, philosophy of education, the American educational system, and similar basic subjects.

Another way in which the new interest in teaching will express itself is in the organization of associations of college teachers paralleling the national learned societies. In some instances these associations will be sections of national organizations, as is the case in chemistry, or they may be separate organizations, as in the case of the Mathematical Association of America. The group whose example might well be followed in this respect is the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education. The teaching staffs of engineering colleges recognize that they function both as engineers and as teachers. As engineers they belong to their national engineering societies; as teachers they are members of the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education. No group of college teachers has for so many years taken so great an interest in the problems of college teaching. It culminated several years ago in a report on engineering education which is a masterly treatment of the subject and which has had far-reaching effects. It also resulted in the summer schools for teachers of engineering, which have been successfully conducted for a number of years. These schools have not been confined to technical engineering subjects; they have included sessions for teachers of physics, mathematics, economics, and English. The American Association of University Professors might well assist in this work and might even assume the responsibility, with the cooperation of the appropriate societies, for conducting similar schools in fields unrelated to engineering.

The Experimental Attitude

We should expect the same evolution and advance in our teaching that we find, and help to produce, in our subject-matter. The process of bringing this about is experimentation. Teachers must maintain an experimental attitude toward their work, always being willing to

consider possible improvements and new methods. They should also be ready to carry on, or to cooperate in, large-scale experimentation. So eminently successful have some recent experiments been that there is no longer any question as to the value of such studies. For example, at Ohio State University, the Botany Department, with the help of testing experts from the College of Education, has been conducting for nearly a decade rigidly controlled experiments upon the teaching of the elementary course. Not only has the original objective been attained, namely, that of making a better course for the ninety-three percent who do not go on with botany, but the course has proved also to be a much better preparation for the seven percent who continue their work in the subject.

Teaching will never receive the recognition which it should have until we are as proud to be college teachers as we are to be historians, chemists, and philologists. Improvement of teaching is contingent upon the active interest of college administrators and college professors. Such an interest will bring a reconsideration of the functions of the college, of the department, and of the individual course, and will inevitably lead to greater emphasis upon good teaching.

HOMER L. DODGE

THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND THE UNIVERSITY

The corner-stone of the Iowa plan for teacher training was laid in 1912 with the establishment of a general policy which sought to enlist, in a cooperative teacher-training program, the educational forces of the entire campus. The policy had its origin in the belief that the training of any person who was to assume one of the most difficult and responsible tasks in our society, the formal education of our children, would demand the best resources of the University.

Immediately upon the adoption of the policy, the College of Education of the University of Iowa moved to translate it into a program of action. This resulted in indicating the three major functions of a complete teacher-training program. The first of these three functions is the selection of the prospective teaching personnel. The other two are insistence upon scholarship in the teaching field and the insurance of professional competency.

Twenty years ago no little irritation between the academic and professional faculties existed on this campus with both groups out to defend their respective preserves. Review and elimination of

these items of annoyance were necessary in view of the adopted policy. Matters such as separate registration in education for prospective teachers, majoring students in education although they definitely expected to teach some content subject, the proper office to present the prospective teachers at convocation for the granting of their degrees, location of power to dictate the content curriculums for teachers, and the fact that, in the opinion of many, too much professional education was required of all students in training for teaching—these and more were bones of contention. Today these irritating issues of 1912 seem of little moment. Fortunately, the College of Education at Iowa considered them insignificant twenty years ago. The College of Education said in effect that the central registrar's office performed every function of registration needed. It maintained, also, that students preparing for teaching should major in the academic field they propose to teach, that the liberal-arts and graduate deans were well practiced and competent to do all the honors in recommending candidates for the conferring of degrees, that in the matter of the dictation of the content curriculums it was clear the College of Education possessed no magic competency, and that only the most conservative minimum of professional courses consistent with teacher-certification demands would be recommended. Action on such items as these gave concrete assurance to the academic faculties that their domain would not be harmfully invaded by the College of Education.

With the removal of these irritations, it was possible to move immediately to the consideration of some of the important issues for which the established policy of cooperative teacher training called. Problems such as the relationship of the college curriculums to the teaching programs in the secondary schools furnished a line of departure. From such simple beginnings the studies have advanced to detailed content studies in both the academic and the professional fields. Many experiments in learning and method have been and are being carried on cooperatively by the professional and academic faculties. The cumulative effect of these studies and experiments has not only resulted in important improvements in teacher training but has laid a permanent foundation for the continued study of the college curriculum of the teacher. The only check on this program is the time limit of the faculty.

In the early stages of this program, the academic departments felt the need of having on their staffs persons who were specifically pre-

pared to handle teacher-training programs in the content fields. Although professors qualified to do this work were hard to find, they were employed whenever possible. The only limitation to the complete establishment of permanent liaison professors in the divisions where needed is the fact that they are not available. These professors must have majored in the content field they represent and are obliged to have studied only such education courses as will insure professional competency. Since these officers must, in the long run, serve on the graduate level in the matter of professional training of college teachers, this requirement is not only desirable but absolutely essential. These professors hold joint appointments in the College of Education and the College of Liberal Arts, with professorial ranks in the latter division. These liaison officers, since they are members of both the academic and the professional faculties, represent essential factors in a cooperative teacher-training program. Wherever they have not been members of both the faculties the program has suffered.

These joint appointments account in no small measure for the small number of courses offered in education on the undergraduate level on this campus. It may be confidently said that in the degree this type of cooperation succeeds, in that degree need for purely professional education lessens. Today, fifteen hours of required professional education represents the maximum. It is the belief of many of us on this campus that this requirement could be further reduced.

Direct evidence to determine the effect that emphasis upon scholarship has had in the teacher-training program is not available, nor has it been possible to set up any adequate program of prospective teacher selection on the undergraduate level. A study of the average scholarship of students in the various colleges was made recently. The results showed that the teacher-training group was second to the highest. Whether self-selection or stimulation for better scholarship or both in the prospective teacher group contributed to its relatively high standing is not known. In any event, it is gratifying to know that the teacher-training group is found in the upper rather than in the lower ranges of scholarship.

Significant results of the cooperative teacher-training program are found at the graduate level. One illustration will serve to make this clear. Several departments will now permit their graduate majors to submit a professional thesis in partial fulfillment of the degree re-

quirements. This is not often done, but the fact that there is perfect willingness on the part of these academic departments to do so when a case warrants it is significant. It should be borne in mind that whenever a student is permitted to do this he completes all the other regular academic requirements in the department in which he is majoring. These professional theses are jointly directed by representatives from the academic and professional faculties or by the liaison professors in charge of teacher training in the content fields. Such cooperation means much in the solution of teacher-training problems.

Operation of the policy of campus cooperation in the training of teachers has convinced every one who has had any major part in it that it is the only method of achieving satisfactory results. It has also given the institution a new concept of the teacher. Whatever other demands may be made upon the teacher, it is clearer than ever before that he must take his place in society at the best cultural level of his day. This means that he must be permitted and encouraged to do much academic work related to his personal interests which may bear little or no direct relation to his teaching job. As a special agent of society charged with the responsibility of the formal education of our children, we must insist upon thorough scholarship in his teaching field and professional competency. The importance of these factors and their special application to the teacher are better appreciated since the problem of teacher training has been treated as a University responsibility and not one lodged in the College of Education. While the combined faculties of the campus may not be sagacious enough to achieve a perfect solution, it is certain that a better answer will be forthcoming than any division of the campus could independently produce.

In conclusion, special designation of the two major and controlling results of the teacher-training program in operation at Iowa during the past twenty years is important. One of these is the recognition, by the academic and the professional faculties, that the preparation of the teacher is one of the most difficult and responsible functions the University has to perform. The other is that every one is convinced that neither arts nor education may be safely intrusted with the full responsibility of teacher training, and each must fuse its combined knowledge in a cooperative attack upon the problem.

P. C. PACKER

THE TEACHER AS COLLEAGUE

The primary duty of the college teacher is unquestionably to teach in his chosen field as well as he can. But to say that this is his primary duty is not to say that it is his only duty: academic life is not so simple as that. His teaching is not done in a local world consisting exclusively of his classroom, his departmental office, and the library: it is done in a local world which includes many departmental interests besides his own, and many activities and experiences other than teaching and learning. And that local world itself exists not in isolation but as an affected element in, and as a creative force for, the surrounding human world. These facts involve for the teacher, in the first place, appreciation of the significance of other departmental interests besides his own, and, in the second place, participation in the study and the solution of the extremely difficult problems of the college enterprise as a whole.

Fortunately, even if his passion be for the teaching of his own subject, he may be sure that his teaching will be enriched by better knowledge of allied, or even distant, curricular fields, and by entering into the interests of his colleagues; and that alert participation in the general college enterprise will make his teaching more effective by giving him a clearer perception of its function, a surer understanding of the real dispositions and needs of the contemporary student body, and a better adjustment to the conditions and the opportunities of the whole collegiate environment and of the surrounding social environment.

Of course, if a man thinks of a professorship merely as a job, or as an endowment of his enjoyment of his own particular line of intellectual curiosity, he can "get by" with a minimum of activity outside his classroom and his study—but he "gets by" into a narrow selfishness which is inconsistent with the basic purpose of the college. If, on the other hand, he has anything of the true teacher's underlying fire of concern for the growth of his students, I do not see how he can rightly avoid the enlargement of his own experience and activity through such appreciation and such participation as have been suggested.

How shall one gain appreciation of the significance of other departmental interests besides one's own? Divisional, as against departmental, organizations or gatherings of any sort, formal or informal, are definitely helpful. At Oberlin, two or three years ago, the

departments of physics, chemistry, geology, botany, and zoology each in turn held open house for an evening, inviting all members of the other departments of the group to be present, and demonstrating the work of the department, typically, through a brief general talk followed by visits to various parts of the laboratory where different phases of the work of the department could be inspected. Advanced students served as guides and in some cases as demonstrators.

Such intradivisional appreciation is not enough, however. Something more can be gained, for instance, through "shop clubs" with members drawn from various departments. Such a club, which meant much to me when I was an instructor at Harvard, consisted of several young instructors and their wives. The varying talks representing different departmental interests were illuminating. The Oberlin departmental open-house plan might well be extended and modified in such a way as to enable departments in different divisions to see something of each other's work.

Individually, one may gain much through deliberate reading, occasional or more than occasional, of books or articles in fields other than one's own. I made it a practice at one time to spend an hour or two, once or twice a semester, making the rounds of a periodical room, getting the feel of periodicals and articles in subjects quite other than my own, and reading brief articles here and there, even though I had not much hope of understanding them very well. Exchange of reprints with men in other departments has the same effect, if one reads the reprints one receives. A professor of botany and I once agreed that we would each read a certain number of the other's articles. I, for one, enjoyed the experience—and really knew something about cycads when I got through. Naturally, if one does much of this sort of thing, it is easier to understand the purposes and the ideas of one's colleagues, and to get a clearer and more complete comprehension of the teaching effort of the college as a whole; and one gains thereby in one's own teaching through seeing one's own work in perspective, through acquaintance with points of view and with methods which might otherwise have remained foreign, and through the ability to correlate the work of one's students with that which they do in other departments and to draw occasional illustrations from the work of other departments.

Similarly, one gains in breadth, and one's teaching gains in efficiency, if one enters with hearty readiness into the broad and largely different range of problems which confront the college as a whole.

Some of these are particular problems of current administration or interpretation which arise under adopted policies—problems relating to the improvement of instruction; the giving of curricular advice; the giving of other personal advice; the approval or disapproval of proposed new courses; the maintenance of honors work; attendance; grading or ranking systems; supplementary instruction (lectures, assembly talks, recitals, and the like); special opportunities for exceptionally able students; living conditions of students; fraternities and sororities; extra-curricular activities; student aid; discipline; admission; alumni relations; appointments; and budget.

Other problems are themselves problems of policy: periodic or special revisions of long-standing policies of the types indicated in the preceding paragraph, or problems of innovation or of reorganization. The college ought frequently to define its aims in the light of its relation to a constantly changing society; it ought to maintain a vital curricular and administrative plasticity; it ought just now to consider carefully the question of recognizing and capitalizing the cleavage between the upper and the lower college, together with the extent to which it can achieve distribution (and, I believe, socialization) of studies in the lower college and the extent to which it can expand honors work in the upper college. Many colleges ought frankly to face the question as to whether they have a financial or educational right to continue as four-year colleges. In short, the college ought intelligently to direct its own evolution.

There are, furthermore, a multitude of lesser and particular problems, still relatively new, which have not, in general, become matters of adopted policy. Such, for instance, are those relating to comprehensive examinations; new-type examinations; examinations by external examiners; the tutorial or preceptorial system; sectioning on the basis of ability; the size of sections; the conference plan of study; reading periods before examinations; credit for field employment; credit for practical work in the fine arts, music, and drama; credit for private reading; the regrouping of departments; the recognition of training in the use of English and of other languages, and in reflective thinking, as a common, not a departmental, responsibility; the quarter system; special guidance for freshmen; orientation and other survey courses.

All these problems, both those of current administration and interpretation and those involving the determination of new policies, must be faced and answered wisely if the college is to progress, is

really to live a worthy educational life. Who shall face and answer these problems? The administration alone? Not for a moment. A small group of "elder statesmen" alone? Not for a moment. The task is so large, so difficult, so vital that it demands the hearty participation of the entire faculty. Every teacher should be ready to bear his part of this varied and heavy common burden—which is also a rich common opportunity.

I have said that such problems must be answered wisely. How is the requisite wisdom to be gained? It should be obvious that neither mastery of one's own subject nor even sheer teaching ability serves automatically to qualify a man for these non-departmental tasks. In point of fact, these problems have generally been faced by groups of men who, for the most part, have not been adequately qualified to face them. Faculties and faculty committees, typically, have worked away by a rather primitive method of trial and error, and largely or completely in disregard of solutions attempted or achieved elsewhere. The very types of procedure which the individual faculty man would condemn in his own field of scholarship all too often characterize the activities of faculty men when they work in groups and on matters of extra-departmental concern.

The proper facing of such problems calls for deliberate training during the period of the teacher's preparation, and for scientific attitudes and methods on the part of teachers in service. College teachers are trained in graduate schools: graduate schools ought, therefore, to provide training looking toward the preparation of young teachers to take their part in the facing of such problems. The most natural way of doing this would seem to be the maintenance in the graduate school of a general course on college education as a whole, or, better, of a small group of courses dealing more carefully with particular types of college problems. In either case, the conveyance of familiarity with the already large bibliography and the establishment of the habit of reading current literature in this field would be of more importance than the expression of particular opinions by those in charge of the course or courses.

Such courses might be given either as one-man courses or as co-operative. They might be given by the department or school of education; or they might be given—in this case, of necessity, co-operatively—by a group of members of the faculty of arts and sciences who had themselves been active and successful in the meeting of such problems.

Given a faculty of teachers without, or preferably with, such training, how may they best approach scholarliness in their treatment of the general problems of the college? If the faculty once gets the idea that scholarly activity is as appropriate, as necessary, and as valuable in the treatment of these problems as in direct connection with one's own teaching or research, the desired results will follow—in large measure, at least, and in due time.

The starting point of scholarly work in a given departmental field is the bibliographical control of that field. The starting point of scholarly work in the facing and answering of the major problems of college education should be the bibliographical control, by the faculty, of the standard and the current discussions of these problems.

How may such control be gained? The field is large, and production in it is swiftly increasing. No one faculty man, whether teacher or administrator, can possibly cover the whole field. The answer, it seems to me, lies in the adoption of a plan of cooperative bibliographical control. This would mean the assignment, either through a standing committee or through direct administrative request, of certain periodicals and certain books to individual members of the faculty. The responsibility of each reader would be to determine whether, in his judgment, the material read by him contained anything of value for his college, and if so, to bring it to the attention of the appropriate officer or committee or group, or to the faculty as a whole.

Certain periodicals which are likely to contain a considerable amount of relevant material, the *Journal of Higher Education*, the *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, the *Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges*, and *School and Society*, for instance, should presumably be read by more than one man, various plans of the division or the desirable duplication of labor being obviously possible. Other more general periodicals might safely be left to one man each. The more important new books might well be read by two or three men, who should consult before reporting.

The ordinary processes of scholarship involve knowledge by each scholar of what other scholars have recently done in the same field. How may we reach a corresponding procedure with reference to our common college problems, in so far as they are not covered by the process of bibliographical control above suggested? The better that control, of course, the less uncovered field there will be. But must

Oberlin, for instance, face each such problem without reference to what other colleges have recently done in the same matters? How may the significant experience of any one college be made available to all?

Questionnaires indiscriminately distributed are worse than useless. Inquiries addressed to a selected group of colleges are better, but never satisfactory. I have often wished that there might be some central office where a copy of every significant piece of local college work with reference to a problem of general interest might be carefully filed; that lists of such documents might periodically be made available to all interested colleges; and that copies of any desired document might be secured by any college on payment of the cost involved. I am inclined to believe that the American Association of University Professors might appropriately undertake the maintenance of such an office and such a service.

ERNEST H. WILKINS

LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, IMPROVEMENT IN COLLEGE TEACHING

The report of the Committee on Graduate Training for Collegiate Teaching, including representatives from Teachers College and Columbia College, makes the following recommendations:

Wherever possible graduate students should be used as assistants.

Young teachers should have much more systematic counsel than has been the usual practice. Policies of the department, procedures, and techniques should be carefully outlined for their benefit.

The new teachers should be encouraged to visit the classes of older faculty members and discuss methods observed.

A general lectures course for all prospective college teachers on collegiate education in America is advised.

In conclusion, the report urges that "a college in a university is in a position important for experimentation, since it has a selected group of students, a selected group of instructors, and immediate contact with large groups of graduate students and with a school of education. So far as practicable the colleges within a university should cooperate with both graduate faculties and the school of education in the formulation of and carrying out of plans for the improvement of college teaching."

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE, CHAPTER PROGRAM FOR THE YEAR

At each of the monthly meetings of the chapter from October to April, inclusive, three or four committees are scheduled for reports. Among the topics listed are Local Improvement in College Teaching, Student-Faculty Relations, Student Finances, Evaluation of Extra-Curricular Activities, Honor Systems, Retirement, and Increasing Membership. All meetings are held in the Faculty Club Rooms. The October meeting was addressed by Professor W. W. Cook, President of the Association, on the history and aims of the Association.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, "DEPRESSION" COURSES IN BUSINESS

In view of unemployment and the number of young executives who through no fault of their own have lost their jobs, a special emergency session in the Business School will start January 30, 1933, and continue to August 16.

Students who attend the session will have the same classroom in-

struction under the same faculty as the regular first-year class. They will be entitled to full academic credit, thus enabling them to enter the second-year class next fall. Midyear examinations will be cut out. Three week-end vacations of four days each will be substituted for the recesses of the usual academic year. The extra session is open to college graduates and to those who have had executive experience in business.

One effect of the shorter period covered by the extra session is a reduction in the expense for room and board. Although the tuition is unchanged at \$600, room and board will amount to less than \$400, so that total school expense, including necessary text books, will not be over \$1000. A limited amount of financial aid from the Loan Fund will be available for properly qualified students in this session.

Over 80% of last June's class of 395 men, the School reports, are known to be employed, and only about 10% of the class have their names on the School's active list as seeking jobs. Many were temporarily employed this summer. This is close to a normal condition at this time of year.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Finances

The staff and employees of the Institute have undertaken to lay up a reserve against a possible deficit in case the year's income is reduced below present expectations.

The Institute's budget is now balanced, but this action has been taken to create a reserve which may be drawn upon in case income from endowments should fall appreciably below the figure indicated by the present dividend rates.

This salary reserve fund is to be set up from two sources. The first source is the "Professors' Fund" which has been accumulating for more than a year from the 50 per cent contributions of income earned by members of the staff for professional services rendered to parties other than the Institute during the terms of the Institute session. The professors themselves have voted that this fund shall be used to set up a plan for leaves of absence to enable members of the staff to increase their professional contacts and opportunities for research. They have, however, now voted to put such portion of this fund as may be required at the disposal of the Institute for meeting its operating expenses in case these should exceed the income for the year.

The second source of funds consists of a deposit of 10 per cent of salaries or wages, after deducting an exemption of \$500, to be accumulated between December 1, 1932, and July 1, 1933, with the understanding that any balance of this fund which may not be needed in meeting the operating expenses of the Institute shall, on July 1, be returned *pro rata* to those who have contributed to it.

There has been no reduction in salaries at the Institute and this action is not considered as such.

Unemployed Engineers and Architects

The Institute again offers twelve courses free of charge to unemployed engineers and architects with the necessary preparation. The subject matter includes accounting, marketing, distribution of electricity for light and power, foundations and soil, mechanics, hydraulics, highway engineering, materials, refrigeration, reinforced concrete design, theory of structures, European civilization, and art from Greece to modern times.

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA, CHAPTER ACTIVITIES

The plan for the year centers around an attempt to encourage departments to formulate the aims of their work and to evaluate their accomplishment in the light of its aims.

The first meeting was addressed by Professor H. L. Dodge, who reported for the Association's Committee, on The Improvement of College Teaching. At the November meeting there will be a discussion of the Obligations of a Member of the Faculty to Extra-Curricular and Community Enterprises. Three meetings will be devoted to reports from various divisions of the university which have special curricula, such as Journalism, Home Economics, and Business Administration. At another meeting the unified direction of all higher education in the state will be discussed.

Since most of the chapter's meetings are semi-public dinner meetings, at which wives and other guests are present, the local chapter has invited the president of the university to attend all meetings of this kind.

NEW CHAPTERS

Chapters have recently been organized at the following institutions: Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Texas Christian University,

Morehead State Teachers College, University of Denver, University of Tulsa, and the University of Akron. These bring the total number of chapters up to date to 218.

MEMBERSHIP

ACTIVE MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of one hundred and twenty-two active and fifty-one junior members, as follows:

Augustana College, Anne G. Byrd; Brenau College, Alice L. Brown; Brown University, Arthur M. Banta; Butler University, Paul Hinkle; Capital University, Paul L. Schacht; University of Chicago, Gerald E. Bentley; University of Cincinnati, Carter V. Good; City College (New York), Percy L. Bailey, Jr., Joseph Tynan; Clarkson School of Technology, Donald D. Kennedy; University of Colorado, G. G. Fullerton; Connecticut Agricultural College, Cecil G. Tilton, Albert Waugh; Cornell University, Julian L. Woodward; Dartmouth College, William J. Rose; University of Denver, Benicia Batione; Colleges of the City of Detroit, Edward R. Bascom, Edward J. Bird, Georges Gomez de Sarzana, Joseph Jasper, Roy L. Judkins, Arthur E. Remick, Irvin W. Sander, Marino H. Tanzi, William M. Trap, Norman G. Wann; Drake University, David F. Owens, John R. Stockton; Florida State College for Women, Lanas S. Barber; Furman University, Sidney E. Bradshaw; George Peabody College for Teachers, Michael J. Demiashkevich, Charles W. Knudsen, Tasso T. Lindsey, J. Russell Robinson; George Washington University, William A. Hunter, Joseph H. Roe; Georgia State College for Women, Blanche Tait; University of Georgia, Paul R. Morrow; Goucher College, Karl J. R. Arndt; Hunter College, Philip R. V. Curoe, Frederick Thiele; Illinois Wesleyan University, William E. Kritch; Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia), J. B. Stroud; Lewiston State Normal School, Roy E. Rodock; University of Louisville, Elliott McDowell; Marquette University, Joseph C. Bock, Paul J. Mundie, Stewart Scrimshaw; University of Maryland, Frieda W. McFarland; University of Michigan, Henry F. Adams, G. E. Densmore, Howard M. Ehrmann, Charles L. Jamison, Albert H. Marckwardt, Warner F. Patterson, John R. Reinhard, Arthur Van Duren, Jr., William H. Worrell; Middlebury College, Ennis B. Womack; Millsaps College, Charles F. Nesbitt; University of Minnesota, Mary Shirley; Morehead State Teachers College, John L. Sullivan; University of New Mexico, Jay C. Knode; New York University, Albert Sheppard; North Carolina State College, G. Howard Satterfield; University of North Dakota, Carman G. Blough, Roy E. Brown, Thomas W. Cape, John E. Howard, Frank L. Johnson, Joseph Meidt, A. G. Ronhovde, Arthur K. Saiki, Frederick Weltzin; Northwestern University, Russell A. Fisher; Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Meredith F. Burrill, George H. White; University of Oregon, Guy S. Claire, Leo Friedman, Mozelle Hair, W. D. Wilkinson; Park College, Charles F. Metz; Pennsylvania State College, Marion S. McDowell, M. Elizabeth Westgate; University of Pennsylvania, Edwin P. Norris; University of Pittsburgh, William I. Miller; Robert College, Llewellyn T. Evans, Willis B. Hazleton, George H. Huntington, Laurence S. Moore, L. A. Scipio, Edward F. Wilsey; Shurtleff College, Harold B. Allen; Simmons College, Carl A. Pearson, Sara Stites; University of Southern California, Ada C. Holme; Temple University, Francis T. Allen, John A. Tousaw; Texas Christian University, John W. Ballard, Walter S. Knox; Texas State College for Women, Spencer

L. Stoker; Texas Technological College, W. E. Street; Thiel College, Katherine G. Blyley, Signe I. Swensson; University of the City of Toledo, Paul W. Stansbury; Virginia Polytechnic Institute, M. Buford Blair; Washington University, Ewing P. Brady; Westminster College (Pennsylvania), Bertha A. Bay; College of Wooster, Warren Spencer.

TRANSFERS FROM JUNIOR TO ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP

University of California (Los Angeles), Lawrence Gahagan; The Citadel, Frank C. Tibbetts; Colleges of the City of Detroit, Clarence B. Hilberry; Elmira College, Frank Harris; Geneva College, Ruth A. Firor, Cornelius A. Tilghman; George Washington University, Mitchell Dreese; Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Nicholas Oboukhoff; Rose Polytechnic Institute, John L. Bloxome, Harve N. Chinn; Temple University, N. William Newsom; Texas State College for Women, Max L. Shipley; Union College, H. R. Enslow.

JUNIOR MEMBERS ELECTED

University of Arkansas, Robert W. Leeper; Augustana College, Fritiof O. Ander; Brooklyn College, Benjamin Grosbayne; University of California, Robert J. Parker; Case School of Applied Science, E. W. McCullough; University of Chicago, Horace J. Nickels; University of Cincinnati, Raymond D. Gerwe; City College (New York), Giovanni E. Conterno; Columbia University, Mowat G. Fraser; Cornell University, Carl M. White; University of Florida, Joseph E. Price; Georgia School of Technology, Montgomery Knight; Gustavus Adolphus College, Samuel F. Johnson; Harvard University, Carl Ginsburg, Job E. Johnson, Willard B. Pope; Hillsdale College, Quirinus Breen; Lewiston State Normal School, Howard O. Hollin; University of Louisville, Edmund K. Hall, Hampden Lawson, Edward C. Sweeney; University of Michigan, Wallace C. Brown; Montana State College, Mary H. Marshall; North Carolina State College, George B. Lay; University of North Carolina, Van Courtlandt Elliott, Daniel J. Whitener; University of Oregon, Ralph W. Leighton; University of Pittsburgh, W. A. Lunden; Rutgers University, Victor Tiedjens; Skidmore College, J. Theodore Morgan; Swarthmore College, Holbrook M. MacNeille; University of Texas, May E. Francis; Washington University, Carl F. Cori; Yale University, Florence E. Hooper, Elizabeth Murphy, Lawrence W. Slanetz; Not in University Connection, R. Bowling Barnes (Ph.D., Johns Hopkins), Berlin, Germany; Arthur E. Boss (Ph.D., Illinois), Barberton, O.; Esther E. Dizmang (B.S., Kansas State), Chicago, Ill.; Larkin H. Farinholt (Ph.D., Oxford), Baltimore, Md.; Robert A. Fisher (Ph.D., Ohio State), Pittsburgh, Pa.; Charles M. Gewertz (Sc.D., Mass. Inst. Technology), New York, N. Y.; Norene Holliday (A.M., Georgia), Marion, Va.; John C. Johnson (Ph.D., California), West Chester, Pa.; Carl J. Kulsrud (Ph.D., Harvard), Austin, Minn.; Harriet Major (B.S., Virginia), Asheville, N. C.; Hans Nabholz (M.A., New York), Newark, N. J.; Vienna W. Roberts (M.A., Yale), Chicago, Ill.; Robert L. Sharp (Ph.D., Harvard), Cambridge, Mass.; Lillian Starr (M.A., Bryn Mawr), Cohoes, N. Y.; Mary E. Taylor (B.S., Columbia), Shepherdstown, Pa.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following one hundred and fifty-six nominations for active membership and forty-four nominations for junior membership are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions¹ and will be considered by the Committee if received before January 25, 1932.

The Committee on Admissions consists of E. S. Brightman, Boston, Chairman; W. C. Allee, Chicago; A. L. Bouton, New York; H. L. Crosby, Pennsylvania; A. C. Lane, Tufts; A. O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins; W. T. Magruder, Ohio State; Julian Park, Buffalo.

Alma Ackley (Biology), City of Detroit
Donald B. Anderson (Botany), North Carolina State
Everett L. Austin (Education), Michigan State
Linton L. Barrett (Spanish), Alabama
Eleanor E. Barry (Education), Hunter
Henry F. Becker (Geography), Florida State for Women
Philip M. Benjamin (English), Allegheny
Sarah S. Bissell (English), City of Toledo
William M. Blaisdell (Business Administration), Temple
May A. Blanchard (Home Economics), City of Toledo
Beulah B. Briley (Economics, Commerce), Florida State for Women
Paul A. Brown (English), Temple
Guy E. Buckingham (Education), Allegheny
Claude A. Campbell (Economics), Alabama
James T. Caswell (Political Science), Michigan State
Jean Christie (French), Occidental
W. A. Cleveland (Agricultural Economics), North Dakota Agricultural
G. Reginald Crosby (Economics), Dartmouth
John W. Cummings (Religion), Trinity (Texas)
W. Harold Dalglish (History), Lafayette
William J. Dana (Mechanical Engineering), North Carolina State
Charles K. Davenport (Philosophy), Virginia
Maude B. Davis (Education), Trinity (Texas)
Ezda Deviney (Zoology), Florida State for Women
Gustav Dippold (Agricultural Education), Missouri
John W. Dodds (English), Pittsburgh
Frank G. Edson (Chemistry), William Jewell
Ralph L. Eyman (Education), Florida State for Women
Lewis D. Fallis (Public Speaking), Texas Christian
Lewis G. Freeman (Pharmacy), Buffalo
Marie K. Gallagher (Education), Hunter
Eugenia Galtsoff (Zoology), George Washington
Josiah B. Game (Classics), Florida State for Women

¹ Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Washington Office, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

Glenn W. Giddings (Physics), De Pauw
James L. Glanville (History), Southern Methodist
Marion T. Griggs (French), Pittsburgh
Olive J. Grigsby (Psychology), Denver
Omar C. Held (Psychology), Pittsburgh
Sarah Herndon (English), Florida State for Women
Granville Hicks (English), Rensselaer Polytechnic
Jerome C. Hixson (English), De Pauw
Irwin S. Hoffer (Economics), Temple
Martin K. Howes (Chemistry), Allegheny
Paul E. Johnson (Philosophy, Sociology), Hamline
Rowland Leach (Music), De Pauw
Edward W. McFarland (Economics, Sociology), City of Detroit
Walter H. Mais (Physics), Brooklyn
Yetta Mitchell (Speech), Trinity (Texas)
Arthur E. Murphy (Philosophy), Brown
Philip Petsch (German), California (Los Angeles)
Hereward T. Price (English), Michigan
Harold F. Richards (Physics), Florida State for Women
Charles V. Robinette (Biology), Arkansas State Teachers (Conway)
Nelle A. Robinson (Languages), Trinity (Texas)
Victor T. Sander (Animal Husbandry), North Dakota Agricultural
Ernest F. Schaefer (Chemistry), Akron
Ruth Schornherst (Biology), Florida State for Women
Maud Schwalmeyer (Education), Florida State for Women
Harold L. Scott (History), Robert
Lawrence H. Seltzer (Economics), City of Detroit
Curtis F. Sheley (Languages), Arkansas State Teachers (Conway)
Lloyd B. Sholl (Pathology), Michigan State
Robert W. Siddle (Physiology), Missouri
Ada B. Stapleton (English), Vanderbilt
D. B. Swingle (Botany), Montana
Charles K. Trueblood (Psychology), Brown
Walter T. Watson (Sociology), Southern Methodist
Carleton L. Wiggin (Psychology), Wesleyan (Connecticut)
A. N. Wray (Sociology), South Dakota State Teachers (Aberdeen)

NOMINATIONS FOR JUNIOR MEMBERSHIP

Frank G. Brooks (Biology), Johns Hopkins
Donovan F. Emch (Political Science), City of Toledo
Lyle K. Henry (Psychology), Iowa
William S. Hoffman (Physiological Chemistry), Chicago
Otis C. Ingebritsen (Psychology), Chicago
Margaret M. H. Kunde (Physiology), Chicago
Frederic C. Schmidt (Chemistry), Union
John J. Sheinin (Anatomy), Northwestern
Susanna P. Zwemer (History, Political Science), Morningside

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF NOMINATIONS
FOR ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP

Robert O. Bausman (Agricultural Economics), Delaware
Raymond Bixler (History), Ashland
Harold L. Black (Mathematics), Westminister (Pennsylvania)
Dorothy R. Breen (Modern Languages), Florida State for Women
Morris G. Caldwell (Sociology, Economics), Ashland
Earl K. Carter (French), Dartmouth
Alice M. Christensen (History), Florida State for Women
A. T. Cordray (Speech), Westminister (Pennsylvania)
Theodore W. Cousens (Government, Law), Lafayette
Geoffrey E. Cunningham (Chemistry), Clarkson School of Technology
André Delattre (French), City of Detroit
Pierre Delattre (French), City of Detroit
Albert van Eerden (German), Dartmouth
Newman Ertell (Physical Education), City of Detroit
Ben Euwema (English), Westminister (Pennsylvania)
Robert X. Graham (English), Westminister (Pennsylvania)
Helen Haggerty (Physical Education), Florida State for Women
Margaret E. Hamilton (Languages), City of Toledo
Raus M. Hanson (Geography), Virginia State Teachers (Harrisonburg)
Clara W. Hasslock (Home Economics), Georgia State for Women
Robert R. Haun (Physics), Ashland
Laurence F. Hawkins (English), New York
Ernest H. Henrikson (Speech), Gustavus Adolphus
David L. Holmes (Physical Education), City of Detroit
Daniel L. Huffman (Music), Okla. Agricultural and Mechanical
Leonora Ivey (Physical Education), Georgia State Woman's
Horace T. Lavelly (Philosophy), Allegheny
John Lawther (Psychology, Education), Westminister (Pennsylvania)
Anna C. Lee (Classics), Brooklyn
Leland Lewis (Chemistry), Florida State for Women
Mary C. McConagha (Speech), Westminister (Pennsylvania)
Marguerite M. McKee (History), Wells
J. Philip Mason (Chemistry), Boston
Edward P. Mathewson (Metallurgy), Arizona
Marjorie Mayer (Physical Education), Florida State for Women
Katherine W. Montgomery (Physical Education), Florida State for Women
Robert E. Moody (History), Boston
Dale H. Moore (Religion), Lafayette
John G. Moorhead (Physics), Westminister (Pennsylvania)
Juanita C. Moorhead (Spanish), Westminister (Pennsylvania)
Albert Morris (Social Science), Boston
Frank Nowak (History), Boston
John Orr (Bible), Westminister (Pennsylvania)
Milton P. Puterbaugh (Chemistry), Ashland
Marian E. Richley (Physical Education), Toledo

E. B. Russell (History), Westminster (Pennsylvania)
 James H. Russell (Political Science), City of Detroit
 H. Shelton Smith (Religious Education), Duke
 William H. Steiner (Economics), Brooklyn
 Elizabeth Stewart (Modern Languages), Westminster (Pennsylvania)
 James A. Swindler (Physics), Westminster (Pennsylvania)
 Gilbert H. Taylor (Classics), Westminster (Pennsylvania)
 Roy R. Ullman (Education), Ashland
 Gladys E. Warren (Music), Georgia State Woman's
 Florence E. White (French), Westminster (Pennsylvania)
 Marie U. White (English), Duke

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF NOMINATIONS FOR JUNIOR MEMBERSHIP

Edward C. Bardo (Physical Education), Delaware
 Elizabeth H. Blair (Education), Pittsburgh
 Helen W. Dodson (Astronomy), Michigan
 Leonard W. Doob (Sociology), Dartmouth
 Thomas F. Dunn, Jr. (English), Washington (St. Louis)
 G. R. Ellis (Business Administration), Westminster (Pennsylvania)
 William F. Geiger (Education), Dartmouth
 Will D. Gilliam, Jr. (History), Centre
 Archie Higdon (Mathematics), North Dakota Agricultural
 Ward B. Jenks (Speech), MacMurray
 Herman Kaveler (Chemistry), George Washington
 Alexander H. Krappe (Modern Languages), George Washington
 Helene Lippay-Wastl (Physiology), Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania
 Esther L. Long (Modern Languages), Ozarks
 John F. Lontz (Chemistry), Temple
 Karl Lorenz (Music), Columbia
 Norma O. MacRury (French), Boston
 Leon S. Marshall (History), Westminster (Pennsylvania)
 Oscar B. Muench (Chemistry), New Mexico Normal
 E. E. Naylor (Botany), Missouri
 Alexander Nikitin (Chemistry), Delaware
 Henry N. Peters (Psychology), Missouri
 Margaret F. Reed (Business Administration), Westminster (Pennsylvania)
 Laurence J. de Rycke (Economics), Pomona
 S. P. Sashoff (Electrical Engineering), Florida
 George A. Van Lear, Jr. (Physics), Oklahoma
 Thomas C. Watkins (Biology), Washington and Lee

SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF NOMINATIONS FOR ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP

H. L. van de S. Bakhuyzen (Botany), Arizona
 Orville B. Bennett (Mathematics), Colgate

John Breukelman (Biology), Kansas State Teachers (Emporia)
Dingley Brown (Music), Lenoir Rhyne
W. H. Callcott (History), South Carolina
Ashmead C. Carson (Physics), South Carolina
Vernon Cook (Languages), South Carolina
James E. Copenhaver (Chemistry), South Carolina
Arthur L. Davis (German), Ohio Wesleyan
J. Nelson Frierson (Law), South Carolina
Oliver K. Garretson (Education), Arizona
William C. McCall (Education), South Carolina
J. Rion McKissick (Journalism), South Carolina
Frank J. S. Maturo (Spanish), Akron
Charles F. Mercer (Physics), South Carolina
Robert L. Meriwether (History), South Carolina
Harold E. Miller (Biology), Muhlenberg
Hugh S. Morrison (Art), Dartmouth
E. T. Motley (Pharmacy), South Carolina
Hugh R. Murchison (Bible), South Carolina
George E. Olson (Commerce), South Carolina
James T. Penney (Biology), South Carolina
Alfred W. Philips (Mathematics), Kansas State Teachers (Emporia)
Arthur J. Rider (Chemistry), Drake
Winthrop H. Root (German), Williams
John A. Sawhill (Classics), Virginia State Teachers (Harrisonburg)
Josef Schaefer (German), Iowa State Teachers (Cedar Falls)
Isadore Schayer (Physical Education), South Carolina
Robert L. Sumwalt (Civil Engineering), South Carolina
J. A. Thompson (Spanish), Louisiana State
Patterson Wardlaw (Education), South Carolina

SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF NOMINATIONS FOR JUNIOR MEMBERSHIP

F. L. Apperly (Pathology), Virginia Medical
Cleanth Brooks, Jr. (English), Louisiana State
Belle R. Causey (English), Louisiana State
Lorelle Causey (English), Louisiana State
Harry Eisenbrown (German), Dartmouth
J. L. E. Erickson (Chemistry), Louisiana State
Martin L. Riley (Education), Louisiana State
J. Harvey Roberts (Zoology), Louisiana State
Margaret Woods (German), Louisiana State

BULLETIN
OF
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Index
JANUARY-DECEMBER, 1932
(Volume XVIII)



INDEX TO THE BULLETIN, VOLUME XVIII, 1932¹

A

Academic Freedom, —in Europe, 6 439; —in Italy, 2 142; —and **Tenure**, Committee A Report, 1 29; Local Committee on —, 4 304; —in Medical Schools, 8 529; Dismissal Procedure, 7 519; Report of Council, 2 125; —**Statements**, Elon College, 3 235; Milwaukee State Teachers College, 4 302; Mississippi Woman's College, 1 34; State College of Agriculture and Engineering of North Carolina, 3 224; Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 4 303; Rhode Island State College, 7 492; —1923-32, Introduction, 5 326; Principles and Procedure Governing —, 5 329; Committee on —, Extracts from Annual Reports, 5 333; Summaries of Reports of Investigating Committees: West Virginia University, University of Montana, University of Tennessee, Clark University, University of Arizona, University of Louisville, South Dakota State College, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, University of Pittsburgh, University of Missouri, William Jewell College, Lincoln Memorial University, Ohio State University, 5 348-357; Formal Actions by Association Relating to —: Notice of Resignations by Faculty Members, Removal of Mississippi State Institutions from Eligible List, Resolutions Governing Conditions for Placing an Institution on a "Non-Recommended" List, 5 358; Thurstone Plan for Enforcing Principles of Freedom and Tenure, 5 361; List of Formal Reports by Investigating Committees, 5 364; Brief Statements on Tenure Cases, 5 366; Present and Former Members of Committee A, 5 367; Appendix A: Academic Freedom and Tenure, 1915-1922, 5 369; Appendix B: Report of Committee of 1915, 5 378; Appendix C: Expressions of Opinion from Various Sources, 5 392; Bibliography, 5 399

Accrediting of Engineering Colleges, 2 135

Adult, American Association for — Education, 6 434

Agencies for Fostering Social Life of Foreign Students, *S. P. Duggan*, 2 122

American Association for Adult Education, 6 434

American Council on Education, 7 484

American Council of Learned Societies, 4 262; 6 434

American Federation of Teachers, 7 485

American, —Foundations and Their Fields, 2 138; —**Universities and Colleges**, *J. H. MacCracken*, Editor, 2 149; 4 295

Ames, J. S., Selection of Professors, 7 500

Annual Meeting, Academic Freedom and Tenure, 1 29; Address of Professor Dodge, College and University Teaching, 1 24; Address of Professor Yandell Henderson, University Maintenance Costs: Building vs. Instruction, 1 17; Address of President Hutchins, The Professor Pays, 1 19; Address of Retiring President, Advancement of Teaching, *W. B. Munro*, 1 6; Cooperation with Latin-American Universities to Promote Exchange Professorships and Fellowships, Report of Committee L, *L. S. Rowe*, Chm., 2 121; Economic Condition of the Profession and Income Tax Questions, Report of Committee Z, *Alzada Comstock*, Chm., 2 118; Psychology of Learning Processes at Higher Levels, *C. H. Judd*, 2 109; Report of Committee on Pensions and Insurance, *E. W. Patterson*, Chm., 1 31; Study of Tenure of University and College Teachers, *W. W. Cook*, Chm., 4 255; —1932, 6 429; 7 483; Program, 8 528

Antioch College, Scholarship for High School Seniors, 4 297

Appointment Service, Report of Council, 2 126; Report of General Secretary, *H. W. Tyler*, 2 130

Arkansas, University of, —Restriction of Political Activity, 6 459

Associateships, Postgraduate—, University of Wisconsin, 7 515

Association, Breadth of Policy for —, *L. P. Chambers*, 6 466; Genesis of —, 4 305; Headquarters, Organization, Report of General Secretary, *H. W. Tyler*, 2 127; Plans for 1932, 2 130; Correspondence with a Chapter Officer in a Northeastern College, 3 234

Association of American Colleges, 2 148; 6 449; 8 530

¹ Monthly numbers in Italics, pages in Roman, i. e., 2 54; (BR) indicates Book Review.

Association of American Universities, 6 431

Association of Governing Boards, 4 273

Association of University Teachers, 6 439

Associations, Meetings of Educational —, 6 439

Athletics, Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, Annual Report, 6 437

Austin Scholarships for Training Executives, Northwestern University, 3 233

B

Battle of 1932, *W. W. Charters*, Editor, 6 443

Bibliography of Publications by Rhodes Scholars, 3 194

Bingham, *W. J.*, Progress in Intramural Sports, Harvard University, 7 511

Boards of Regents or Trustees, University Control, 4 281

Breadth of Policy for Association, *L. P. Chambers*, 6 466

Brooke, *Tucker*, Chm., Requirements for Master's Degree, Report of Committee M, 3 169

Brown University, Employment of Foreign Students, 7 510

Building, University Maintenance Costs: —vs. Instruction, Address of Professor Yandell Henderson, 1 17

Bulletin, Report of General Secretary, *H. W. Tyler*, 2 128

Butler, *N. M.*, Criticism of Youth, 3 218

By-Laws, 1 41

C

C. R. B. Educational Foundation, 7 488

Calendar Reform, 2 137

California College in China, 4 298

Campbell *O. J.*, Chm., Sabbatical Leaves, 4 306

Career Leaflets, 3 190

Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, 6 436

Carnegie Institution of Washington, Extracts from Report of President, 3 190

Cattell, *J. McK.*, Editor, Leaders in Education (BR), 6 451

Changes and Experiments in Liberal Arts Education, *Kathryn McHale* (BR), 4 293

Chapter, —Activities, University of Oklahoma, 8 578; —Letters, Report of General Secretary, *H. W. Tyler*, 2 128; North Dakota Agricultural College, Program, 2 153; New —s, 8 578; —Note, University of Vermont, 6 464; —Program for Year, University of Delaware, 8 576; Joint Meeting of Southern California —s, 4 297

Chambers, *L. P.*, Breadth of Policy for Association, 6 466

Charters, *W. W.*, Editor, Battle of 1932, 6 443

Chicago, University of—, Pre-Legal Course, *Lucile Eaves*, 4 298; Progress of New Plan, 7 510

China, California College in—, 4 298

College, —of Education and the University, *P. C. Packer*, 8 566; —Entrance Examination Board, 2 135; Improvement in —Teaching, Columbia University, 8 576; Improvement of —Teaching, *H. L. Dodge*, 8 558; Liberal—, *R. L. Kelly*, 4 285; Problem of Interest at the—Level, *Max McConnell*, 3 215; —and Society, *E. H. Wilkins* (BR), 7 508; Self-Study of —Teaching, *W. B. Munro*, 8 549; Study of Tenure of University and —Teachers, Committee Report, *W. W. Cook*, Chm., 4 255; —and University Statistics, 6 440; Accrediting of Engineering —s, 2 135; American Universities and —s, *J. H. MacCracken*, Editor (BR), 2 149; 4 295; Association of American —s, 2 148; 6 449; 8 530; Courses on International Affairs in American —s, *Farrell Symons* (BR), 6 446; Representation of —s in Graduate and Professional Schools, 4 263; —and University Teaching, Committee Report, *W. B. Munro*, Chm., 3 186; 4 257; 6 453; 7 491; Progress Report, 8 533; Address of Professor Dodge, —, 1 24

Columbia University, Improvement in College Teaching, 8 576; Plan for Unemployed Engineers, 2 151

Committee, —s for 1932, 1 93; —Lists, Corrections, 2 148; Present and Former Members of —A, Academic Freedom and Tenure, 1923–1932, 5 367; Report of—to Nominate Officers, 7 483; Other—Business, Report of Council, 2 125; —Reports, —A, Academic Freedom and Tenure, *S. A. Mitchell*, Chm., 1 29; (see also *Academic Freedom and Tenure*); —U, College and University Teaching, *W. B. Munro*, Chm.,

2 125; 3 186; 4 257; 6 453; 7 491; Progress Report, 8 533; Personnel, 3 189; — L, Cooperation with Latin-American Universities to Promote Exchange Professorships and Fellowships, *L. S. Rowe*, Chm., 2 121; — Z, Economic Condition of the Profession and Income Tax Questions, *Alzada Comstock*, Chm., 2 118; — R, Encouragement of University Research, *M. P. Whitney*, Chm., 6 456; — P, Pensions and Insurance, *E. W. Patterson*, Chm., 1 31; — M, Requirements for Master's Degree, *Tucker Brooke*, Chm., 3 169; 4 305; — K, Sabbatical Leaves, *O. J. Campbell*, Chm., 4 306; — W, Study of Tenure of University and College Teachers, *W. W. Cook*, Chm., 4 255

Compensations of the Depression, *R. L. Kelly*, 6 442

Comstock, Alzada, Chm., Economic Condition of the Profession and Income Tax Questions, Report of Committee Z, 2 118

Constitution, 1 37

Cook, W. W., Message from President—, 1 4; Study of Tenure of University and College Teachers, —, Chm., 4 255

Cooperation with Latin-American Universities to Promote Exchange Professorships and Fellowships, Report of Committee L, *L. S. Rowe*, Chm., 2 121

Cooperative Research (BR), 3 220

Correspondence, —with a Chapter Officer in a Northeastern College, 3 234; —From a Member in a Northeastern College, 2 155

Council, —Business, 6 429; Report of—: Academic Freedom and Tenure, Committee on College Teaching, Other Committee Business, General, 2 125

Course, Pre-Legal—, University of Chicago, 4 298; —s, "Depression"—in Business, Harvard University, 8 576; Free— for Unemployed Engineers and Architects, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 8 577; Holiday— in Europe, 4 266; —on International Affairs in American Colleges, *Farrell Symons* (BR), 6 446; Resolutions in Regard to — in Education, Tulane University, 6 463; Summer —, 4 267; — for Unemployed, Lafayette College, 7 514

Credit Hunting vs. Education, *W. M. Lewis*, 7 504

Criticism of Youth, *N. M. Butler*, 3 218

Current Economic Condition of the Profession, 5 401

D

Dates of Meetings, 7 484

Degree, —of Doctor of Modern Languages, Middlebury College, 7 514; Requirements for Master's—, Report of Committee M, *Tucker Brooke*, Chm., 3 169; 4 305; Doctorates in Sciences Conferred in 1931, 2 138; 7 489

Delaware, University of—, Chapter Program for Year, 8 576

Department Organization, University of Illinois, 4 299

Directors of Finance, University Control, 4 283

Disarmament, Student View of—, 4 262

Dismissal Procedure, 7 519

Doctorates in Science, 7 489; —s Conferred in 1931, 2 138

Dodds, E. R., What Is Wrong with Modern Universities, 3 206

Dodge, H. L., Address of Professor—, College and University Teaching, 1 24; Improvements of College Teaching, 8 558

Duggan, S. P., Agencies for Fostering Social Life of Foreign Students, 2 122

E

Eaves, Lucile, University of Chicago, Pre-Legal Course, 4 298

Economic, Current—Condition of the Profession, 5 401; —Condition of the Profession and Income Tax Questions, Report of Committee Z, *Alzada Comstock*, Chm., 2 118; —**Conditions**, American Association for Adult Education, 6 434; American Council on Education, 7 484; Battle of 1932, *W. W. Charters*, Editor, 6 443; Compensations of the Depression, *R. L. Kelly*, 6 442; Industrial Fundamentals, 4 287; Institute of International Education, Annual Report, 8 531

Education, Changes and Experiments in Liberal-Arts—, *Kathryn McHale* (BR), 4 293; College of— and the University, *P. C. Packer*, 8 566; Credit Hunting vs.—, *W. M. Lewis*, 7 504; Has—Failed the South? *Lois MacDonald*, 3 211; — Index, 8 531; —, The Liberal College, *R. L. Kelly*, 4 285; New—Fellowship, 3 194; Report of Commissioner of—, 3 194; Resolu-

tions in Regard to Courses in—, Tulane University, 6 463; Science and Faith, Their Claims in Contemporary—, *E. H. Reisner*, 3 212; Recent —al Statistics, 8 530

Eligible List, Additions and Removals, 6 429; Report of Council, 2 126

Elon College, Committee A Statement, 3 235

Employment, —of Foreign Students, Brown University, 7 510; Present Problem of Student—, *R. T. Sharpe*, 7 502; Restriction of—of Foreign Students, 6 440

Encouragement of University Research, *M. P. Whitney*, Chm., 6 456

Engineering, Accrediting of—Colleges, 2 135; Summer Sessions for—Teachers, 7 485

Engineers, Plan for Unemployed—, Columbia University, 2 151; Free Courses for Unemployed—and Architects, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 8 577

Europe, Academic Freedom in—, 6 439; Holiday Courses in—, 4 266

Examination, College Entrance—Board, 2 135

Ex-officio Members, University Control, 4 280

Experimental, Report on—College, University of Wisconsin, 4 300

F

Faculty, Shall University Staff Members Seek Patent Protection? *H. L. Russell*, 4 269; University Control, 4 281

Federal Income Tax Primer for Teachers, *Roswell Magill*, 2 144

Fehling, A. W., *Neue Wege der Wissenschaftsförderung in den Vereinigten Staaten* (BR), 2 150

Fellowship, International — Announcement, Institute of International Education, 3 193; New Education—, 3, 194; —s, Cooperation with Latin-American Universities to Promote Exchange Professorships and —, Report of Committee L, *L. S. Rowe*, Chm., 2 121; Scholarships and —, 6 433; Social Science Research Council, —, 4 261; 6 433

Finance, —s, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 8 577; Report of General Secretary, *H. W. Tyler*, 2 127; What Should a Governing Board Do When Legislature Cuts Down Appropriation? 4 276

Foreign, Agencies for Fostering Social Life of—Students, *S. P. Duggan*, 2 122; Employment of—Students, Brown University, 7 510; —Meetings, 4 266; Plans for—Study in 1932, 2 143; Restriction of Employment of—Students, 6 440

Foundations, American—and Their Fields, 2 138

Freedom in University, *F. P. Graham*, 3 217

G

Genesis of Association, 4 305

German, —Institute for Foreign Students, 4 267; —University System, 3 196

Goucher College, Revision of By-Laws, 2 151

Graduate, New Standards in Selecting—Students, *A. L. Lowell*, 3 208; Representation of Colleges in— and Professional Schools, 4 263

Graham, F. P., Freedom in University, 3 217

Grants, American Council of Learned Societies, 4 262; 6 434; Social Science Research Council, —, 4 261; —in-aid, 6 433

H

Harvard Teachers Record, 3 195

Harvard University, "Depression" Courses in Business, 8 576; Progress in Intramural Sports, *W. J. Bingham*, 7 511

Has Education Failed the South? *Lois MacDonald*, 3 211

Headley, L. A., Making the Most of Books, 7 508

Henderson, Yandell, Address of Professor—, University Maintenance Costs: Buildings vs. Instruction, 1 17

Hill, A. R., University Control, —, *David Kinley*, *W. O. Thompson*, Chm., 4 279

Holiday Courses in Europe, 4 266

Hutchins, R. M., Address of President—, The Professor Pays, 1 19

I

Illinois, University of—, Department Organization, 4 299

Improvement, —of College Teaching, *H. L. Dodge*, 8 558; —in College Teaching, Columbia University, 8 576; —of Teaching, *C. H. Judd*, 8 552

Incomes, Academic—and Planes of Living, Iowa State College, 6 459

Income Tax, Economic Condition of the Profession and—Questions, Report of Committee Z, Alzada Comstock, Chm., 2 118; Federal—Primer for Teachers, Roswell Magill, 2 144; Report of Committee on Pensions and Insurance, E. W. Patterson, Chm., 1 31
Industrial Fundamentals, 4 287
Institute of International Education, 3 192; 4 264; 7 487; Annual Report, 8 531

Institute and Museum of International Education, 3 193

Instruction, University Maintenance Costs: Building vs.—, Address of Professor Yandell Henderson, 1 17

Insurance, Report of Committee on Pensions and —, E. W. Patterson, Chm., 1 31

International, Courses on—Affairs in American Colleges, Farrell Symons, (BR), 6 446; —Education Review, 4 296; —Fellowship Announcement, Institute of International Education, 3 193; Institute and Museum of—Education, 3 193

International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, 7 488

Iowa State College, Academic Incomes and Planes of Living, 6 459

Italy, Academic Freedom in—, 2 142

J

Joint Meeting of Southern California Chapters, 4 297

Journal of Higher Education, 6 448

Judd, C. H., Improvement of Teaching, 8 552; Psychology of Learning Processes at Higher Levels, 2 109

K

Kelly, R. L., Liberal College, 4 285

Kinley, David, University Control, A. R. Hill, —, W. O. Thompson, Chm., 4 279

L

Lafayette College, Courses for Unemployed, 7 514

Languages, Degree of Doctor of Modern—, Middlebury College, 7 514

Latin-American, Cooperation with—Universities to Promote Exchange Professorships and Fellowships, Report of Committee L, L. S. Rowe, Chm., 2 121

Leaders in Education, J. McK. Cattell, Editor (BR), 6 451

Lewis, W. M., Credit Hunting vs. Education, 7 504

Liberal-Arts, Changes and Experiments in—Education, Kathryn McHale (BR), 4 293

Liberal College, R. L. Kelly, 4 285

Local Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, 4 304

Lowell, A. L., New Standards in Selecting Graduate Students, 3 208

M

McConn, Max, Problem of Interest at College Level, 3 215

MacCracken, J. H., Editor, American Universities and Colleges (BR), 2 149; 3 295

MacDonald, Lois, Has Education Failed the South? 3 211

McHale, Kathryn, Changes and Experiments in Liberal-Arts Education (BR), 4 293

Magill, Roswell, Federal Income Tax Primer for Teachers, 2 144

Maintenance, University — Costs: Building vs. Instruction, Address of Professor Yandell Henderson, 1 17

Making the Most of Books, L. A. Headley (BR), 7 508

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Free Courses for Unemployed Engineers and Architects, 8 577; Finances, 8 577

Master's Degree, Requirements for —, 4 305; Requirements for —, Report of Committee M, Tucker Brooke, Chm., 3 169

Mayer, Joseph, Report of Treasurer, 2 126

Medical, Academic Freedom and Tenure in—Schools, 8 529; Too Many —Students, Institute of International Education, 3 192

Meetings, Dates of—, 7 484; —of Educational Associations, 6 439; Foreign—, 4 266

Members Whose Addresses Are Unknown, 7 489

Membership, Changes in—in Association, 1 42; Correspondence from a Member in a Northeastern College, 2 155; Record of— for 1931, 1 92; Report of General Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 2 129

Message from President Cook, 1 4

Middlebury College, Degree of Doctor of Modern Languages, 7 514

Military,—Instruction, Council Business, 6 430; —Training, Journal of Higher Education, 6 448

Millsaps College, Graded Tuition Fees, 7 515

Milwaukee State Teachers College, Committee A Statement, 4 302

Mississippi Woman's College, Committee A Statement, 1 34

Munich, Junior Year in—, Institute of International Education, 3 192

Munro, W. B., Address of Retiring President, Advancement of Teaching, 1 6; —, Chm., College and University Teaching, 4 257; 6 453; 7 491; Progress Report, 8 533

N

Neue Wege der Wissenschaftsforderung in den Vereinigten Staaten, A. W. Fehling (BR), 2 150

New, —Education Fellowship, 3 194; —Standards in Selecting Graduate Students, A. L. Lowell, 3 208

New York University, Conference, 6 461

Nominate, Report of Committee to—Officers, 7 483

North Dakota Agricultural College, Program, 2 153

Northwestern University, Austin Scholarships for Training Executives, 3 233

Notes from Recent Periodicals, 7 509

O

Officers, President, W. W. Cook; Vice-Presidents, E. G. Conklin, F. K. Richtmyer; General Secretary, H. W. Tyler; Treasurer and Executive Secretary, Joseph Mayer

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Committee A Statement, 4 303

Oklahoma, University of—, Chapter Activities, 8 578

P

Packer, P. C., College of Education and University, 8 566

Patent, Shall University Staff Members Seek—Protection? H. L. Russell, 4 269

Patterson, E. W., Chm., Report of Committee on Pensions and Insurance, 1 31

Pensions, Report of Committee on— and Insurance, E. W. Patterson, Chm., 1 31

Peru Summer School, Institute of International Education, 4 265

Plans for Foreign Study in 1932, 2 143

Political, Restriction of—Activity, University of Arkansas, 6 459

Postgraduate Associateships, University of Wisconsin, 7 515

Pre-Legal Course, University of Chicago, Lucile Eaves, 4 298

Present Problem of Student Employment, R. T. Sharpe, 7 502

President, Address of Retiring—, Advancement of Teaching, W. B. Munro, 1 6; Extracts from Report of —, Carnegie Institution of Washington, 3 190; Message from —Cook, 1 4; —, University Control, 4 282

Problem of Interest at College Level, Max McConn, 3 215

Procedure, Dismissal—, 7 519

Profession, Current Economic Condition of the—, 5 401; Economic Condition of the—and Income Tax Questions, Report of Committee Z, Alzada Comstock, Chm., 2 118

Professional, Representation of Colleges in Graduate and—Schools, 4 263

Professor, The—Pays, Address of President Hutchins, 1 19; Selection of —s, J. S. Ames, 7 500; Cooperation with Latin-American Universities to Promote Exchange—ships and Fellowships, Report of Committee L, L. S. Rowe, Chm., 2 121

Progress, —in Intramural Sports, Harvard University, W. J. Bingham, 7 511; —of New Plan, University of Chicago, 7 510

Psychology of Learning Processes at Higher Levels, C. H. Judd, 2 109

Publications, Bibliography of—by Rhodes Scholars, 3 194; —Received, 3 222; 4 296; 6 451; 7 509

R

Reisner, E. H., Science and Faith: Their Claims in Contemporary Education, 3 212

Report, —of Commissioner of Education, 3 194; —of Committee to Nominate Officers, 7 483; — of Council, 2 125; — of General Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 2 127; —of Treasurer, Joseph Mayer, 2 132; (see also *Committee Reports*)

Representation of Colleges in Graduate and Professional Schools, 4 263

Representatives, Association—, 1 99; 2 148; 4 268

Requirements for Master's Degree, Report of Committee M, Tucker Brooke, Chm., 3 169; 4 305

Research, Cooperative—(BR), 3 220; Encouragement of University—, M. P. Whitney, Chm., 6 456; —Fel-

lowships, American Council of Learned Societies, 6 434; —Fellowships and Grants, Social Science—Council, 4 261; 6 433; Historical—Institute in Vienna, 4 266; Carnegie Institution of Washington, Extracts from Report of President, 3 190

Restriction of Employment of Foreign Students, 6 440

Retiring Allowances, Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, 6 436

Rhode Island State College, Committee A Statement, 7 492

Rhodes, Bibliography of Publications by — Scholars, 3 194

Rowe, L. S., Chm., Cooperation with Latin-American Universities to Promote Exchange Professorships and Fellowships, Report of Committee L, 2 121

Russell, H. L., Shall University Staff Members Seek Patent Protection? 4 269

Russell Sage College, Policy for Academic Tenure, 6 461

Rutgers University, Statutes, 6 463

S

Sabbatical Leaves, O. J. Campbell, Chm., 4 306

Salary, Summer School Teaching and—Adjustments, 7 518

Scholarship, —for High School Seniors, Antioch College, 4 297; —s and Fellowships, 6 433; Austin —s for Training Executives, Northwestern University, 3 233

Schweizerische Hochschul-Zeitung (BR), 2 150

Schwoner, Alfred, World-Ranking of Scientists by Nationality (BR), 4 294

Science, Doctorates in—, 7 489; Doctorates in —s Conferred in 1931, 2 138; —and Faith: Their Claims in Contemporary Education, E. H. Reischer, 3 212

Scientists, World-Ranking of —by Nationality, Alfred Schwoner (BR), 4 294

Secretary, Report of General—, H. W. Tyler: Headquarters, Organization, Finance, Chapter Letters, Bulletin, Membership, Appointment Service, Cooperative Relations, Plans for 1932, 2 127

Selection of Professors, J. S. Ames, 7 500

Self-Study of College Teaching, W. B. Munro, 8 549

Shall University Staff Members Seek

Patent Protection? H. L. Russell, 4 269

Sharpe, R. T., Present Problem of Student Employment, 7 502

Social Science Research Council, Annual Report, 4 260; Research Fellowships, 6 433

Southern California, Joint Meeting of —Chapters, 4 297

Sports, Progress in Intramural—, Harvard University, W. J. Bingham, 7 511

Standardizing and Other Agencies Outside of Universities, University Control, 4 280

Statistics, College and University—, 6 440; Recent Educational—, 8 530; College Entrance Examination Board, 2 135

Student, Present Problem of—Employment, R. T. Sharpe, 7 502; —View of Disarmament, 4 262; —s, Agencies for Fostering Social Life of Foreign —, S. P. Duggan, 2 122; Employment of Foreign —, Brown University, 7 510; German Institute of Foreign—, 4 267; New Standards in Selecting Graduate—, A. L. Lowell, 3 208; Restriction of Employment of Foreign—, 6 440; Too Many Medical —, 3 192; Career Leaflets, 3 190; —, University Control, 4 283

Study, Plans for Foreign—in 1932, 2 143

Summer, —Courses, 4 267; —, Plans for Foreign Study in 1932, 2 143; Peru—School, 4 265; —School Teaching and Salary Adjustments, 7 518; —Sessions for Engineering Teachers, 7 485

Symons, Farrell, Courses on International Affairs in American Colleges (BR), 6 446

T

Teacher, The—as Colleague, E. H. Wilkins, 8 570; Federal Income Tax Primer for —s, Roswell Magill, 2 144; Study of Tenure of University and College —s, W. W. Cook, Chm., 4 255; Summer Sessions for Engineering —s, 7 485

Teaching, Advancement of—, Address of the Retiring President, W. B. Munro, 1 6; Improvement in College —, Columbia University, 8 576; Improvement of College —, H. L. Dodge, 8 558; Improvement of —, C. H. Judd, 8 552; Self-Study of College —, W. B. Munro, 8 549; Summer School—and

Salary Adjustments, 7 518; Psychology of Learning Processes at Higher Levels, *C. H. Judd*, 2 109; (see also *College and University Teaching*)

Tenure, Academic Freedom and —, 1 29; Policy for Academic—, Russell Sage College, 6 461; —Question, Address of Retiring President, Advancement of Teaching, *W. B. Munro*, 1 13; Study of— of University and College Teachers, *W. W. Cook*, Chm., 4 255; (see also *Academic Freedom and Tenure*)

Thompson, W. O., University Control, *A. R. Hill*, *David Kinley*, —, Chm., 4 279

Treasurer, Report of—, *Joseph Mayer*, 2 132

Tuition, Graded—Fees, Millsaps College, 7 515

Tulane University, Resolutions in Regard to Courses in Education, 6 463

Tyler, H. W., Report of General Secretary, 2 127

U

Unemployed, Plan for—Engineers, Columbia University, 2 151; Courses for—, Lafayette College, 7 514; Free Courses for—Engineers and Architects, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 8 577

Union Académique Internationale, 8 531

Universities, American—and Colleges, *J. H. MacCracken*, Editor (BR), 2 149; 4 295; Association of American

—, 6 431; What Is Wrong with Modern —? *E. R. Dodds*, 3 206

University, College of Education and the—, *P. C. Packer*, 8 566, College and—Statistics, 6 440; —Control, *A. R. Hill*, *David Kinley*, *W. O. Thompson*, Chm., 4 279; Freedom in the —, *F. P. Graham*, 3 217; German—System, 3 196; —Maintenance Costs: Building vs. Instruction, Address of Professor Yandell Henderson, 1 17; Shall—Staff Members Seek Patent Protection? *H. L. Russell*, 4 269; Study of Tenure of—and College Teachers, *W. W. Cook*, Chm., 4 255; (see also *College and University Teaching*)

V

Vermont, University of—, Chapter Note, 6 464

Vienna, Historical Research Institute in —, 4 266

W

What Is Wrong with Modern Universities? *E. R. Dodds*, 3 206

Wilkins, E. H., The College and Society (BR), 7 508; The Teacher as Colleague, 8 570

Wisconsin, University of—, Postgraduate Associateships, 7 515; Report on Experimental College, 4 300

World-Ranking of Scientists by Nationality, *Alfred Schwoner* (BR), 4 294

Y

Youth, Criticism of—, *N. M. Butler*, 3 218

Appointment Service Announcements

The Appointment Service is open only to members but formal registration is necessary. Those interested in keyed vacancies may have duplicates of their registration blanks transmitted to appointing officers on request.

Members registered with the Appointment Service may have brief announcements inserted in the Teachers Available section at a charge of \$1.00 per line for the first insertion and 50% of that amount for repetitions. Copy should reach the Washington Office not later than the end of the month preceding publication.

Administrative officers who are interested in announcements under Teachers Available may upon inquiry receive copies of registration papers of candidates. Appointing officers are invited to report vacancies at their institutions.

Vacancies Reported

Bacteriology: Temporary appointment, second semester 1932-33, New England college. Elementary course, two days per week.

V 578

Economics: Professor, woman, New England college. Ability to create students' interest; woman of standing among economists; liberal in viewpoint.

V 577

History: Instructor, man, substitute second semester 1932-33, mid-western university. Possible permanent opening in fall for assistant professor. Teach American history (colonial and revolutionary periods, or history of south), and some sections of world history course. Ph.D., experienced. Salary depending on candidate's qualifications.

V 576

Teachers Available

Architecture: D.Tc.S., Vienna Technical U. Eight years in state university; European travel; publications. Available June, 1933.

A 417

Art: Man, LL.D. Six years' experience teaching art and history of art. Known as painter and teacher. Foreign travel.

A 418

Chemistry: Ph.D. Nine years' successful experience in college and university teaching. Research. Publications. Available at once.

A 419

Classics: Highest honors at Harvard. Three years' graduate study abroad. Six years' university teaching.

A 420

Education: Man, Ph.D. Seven years' successful experience in university teaching. Educational psychology or measurements.

A 421

Education and Psychology: Man, 37, married, Ph.D. Columbia. Four years' secondary school and seven years' college teaching experience. Publications. Desires position in college personnel, educational psychology, or measurements. A 422

Engineering: Sc.M. M.I.T. and Harvard, Sc.D. M.I.T. '32, 38, single. Nine years' electrical engineering experience. Speaks Swedish, English, German; reading knowledge French. Prefers communication engineering or mathematics. Available at once. A 423

English: English and American degrees. Assistant professor; ten years' experience. Author and editor. Special interest in Elizabethan period, eighteenth century, and European drama. Available spring 1933, summer session 1933, or academic year 1933-34. A 424

English: Man, married, Ph.D. Yale. Six years' experience as college department head, four years' experience in college administration. Platform experience. Desires position in teaching or administration, or combination of the two. A 425

English: Married, Ph.D. Virginia, 1928. Publications and platform experience. The drama and novel. Available fall of 1933. A 426

English: Ph.D. Harvard, 1921. Ten years' experience directing graduate work. Foreign travel. Research. Publication. Comparative literature in Middle Ages. Professorial rank; \$5000; opportunity for research desired. A 427

French: Man, A.M., near Ph.D. Twelve years' teaching experience in large university. Now assistant professor. Spanish, if desired. Available June, 1933. A 428

German: Man, 38, Ph.D. Six years' teaching experience; German residence, partly American education, world-wide travel, several languages. A 429

German: Man, Ph.D. Fifteen years' experience in middle western and southern institutions; acting head of German department four years in eastern women's college. Travel in Germany. Author of textbook. A 430

History and Government: Ph.D., LL.B. Harvard; eight years' experience; now engaged in research. Wishes opportunity to teach introductory course in one of above, or pre-law course. A 431

History, Political Science: Man, 26, married, Ph.D. California (Bolton). Four years' teaching experience. Available at once.

A 432

Mathematics: Woman, Ph.D. 1931. Ten years' successful experience in college and university teaching. Now an associate professor. Available January 1, 1933.

A 433

Music: Woman, European and American training. Twelve years' college experience in teaching, eleven years of that time as head of department. Special interest in music history and appreciation. Available September, 1933.

A 434

Music: A.B. Superior training here and abroad. Nine years' college experience. Piano, also theoretical courses.

A 435

Philosophy, German (majors): Ph.D. Johns Hopkins. Fourteen years' college teaching. Equipped also to teach psychology, Bible. Available now.

A 436

Philosophy and Religion: Ph.D. Columbia. Six years of college teaching. Publications. Administrative experience, secondary schools, church and social service work.

A 437

Physics: Man (family and dependents), eleven years' experience university teaching; one year European travel. Now on leave studying, desires connection September, 1933.

A 438

Physics and Mathematics: Training for Ph.D. Eight years' teaching experience; state teachers college experience. Available at once for permanent or temporary position.

A 439

Political Science, Economics: Ph.D. Four years' experience in professorial capacity, three fellowships. Public administration and public finance. Publications. Desires either teaching or research. Available fall or summer, 1933.

A 440

Psychology: Man, Ph.D. Four years of college teaching; wide experience in administrative and personnel work. Available now.

A 441

Spanish, French: Man, 35, married, M. A. Eight years with prominent university. Available 1933.

A 442

Zoology or Biology: Man and wife, Ph.D. and M.A. Several years' teaching experience. Will accept joint position or for husband alone.

A 443

LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE

More than 11,000 Universities, Colleges, and Schools are using electrically recorded Lingua-phone Courses as helpful auxiliary in:

| | | |
|----------|----------|------------|
| FRENCH, | GERMAN, | SPANISH, |
| ITALIAN, | RUSSIAN, | POLISH, |
| SWEDISH, | DUTCH, | AFRIKAANS, |
| IRISH, | CHINESE, | PERSIAN, |
| LATIN, | GREEK, | ESPERANTO, |
| | ENGLISH | |

Each course spoken by from 8 to 9 different male and female voices.

Courses were made by more than 150 of the leading language teachers of Oxford, Cambridge, Columbia, The Sorbonne, Berlin, Bonn, Madrid, etc.

Informative Book Free

10 East 43rd Street
NEW YORK CITY

Business and Personal Stationery

PRINTED TO ORDER

on standard bond paper.

LETTERHEADS,
STATEMENTS,
ENVELOPES, INVOICES,
CIRCULARS, CARDS

1000 . . . \$2

5000 . . . \$7

Any job quoted on receipt
of information

Send sample for estimate

Address

DAVID NICHOLS & CO.

Kingston, Georgia

APPOINTMENT SERVICE

Vacancies for the year 1933 will be announced during the coming months. Notices in the *Bulletin* will be of assistance to appointing officers and to candidates, who are invited to make announcements under Vacancies Reported or Teachers Available.

Copy should be received by the 30th of the month preceding date of publication.

American Association of University Professors

744 Jackson Place

Washington, D. C.

(When writing to advertisers, please mention the Bulletin)

